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Abstract

The ‘idea’ of tourism, often understood as an escape from day to day life at home, means that the mundane performances and spaces of everyday life within the tourism experience are rarely considered. In this thesis I demonstrate that by exploring these mundane spaces and practices, a better understanding of the identity performances of individuals whilst away from home can be gained. Taking a reflexive ethnographic approach, this thesis looks at ‘tourist’ identity and everyday life through the lens of the fully inclusive group tour.

The thesis is founded in a ‘reflexive’ interactionism; the relationship between the external world and my internal knowledge of it, where encounters whilst travelling with social objects, both human and more-than-human, inform the narratives. In going on, and participating in, an inclusive group tour I illustrate how mundane aspects of everyday life are performed ‘elsewhere’. Throughout the thesis, I present an insider’s view of the performance of this everyday life and so position myself as both subject of the research as well as researcher. As such, in this thesis I engaged my own culturally and socially situated subjectivities, which alongside encounters with others, resulted in a critical appraisal of self and identity.

The thesis uses (im)mobilities to focus upon three specific spaces of identity practice. First, I look to the representational characteristics of the tour brochure and the images and texts of everyday life. In doing so, I explore representations of everyday life elsewhere and the construction of a tourist imaginary. Second, I explore the everyday encounters and performances of social actors engaged in a fully inclusive group tour, specifically on board the coach. Through this, I examine how social space is implicated in negotiations between the individual-as-tourist whilst also constructing a temporarily mobile community. Third, I look to how spaces of touristic consumption, for example the comfort stop, are re-constructed through the performance of everyday day life whilst on tour.
I show that in order to maintain an individual’s ontological security (for example the ability to make ‘sense’ of daily life) away from home there is a necessary commodification of daily life. Often, as a result of this, the social actor is unproblematically identified and suggested as performing the individual-as-consumer. However, in examining the banal spaces of daily life within an inclusive group tour, I suggest that seemingly ordinary practices of daily life offer the possibility to re-enchant the rationalised ‘commercial’ world in and through which the tourist unreflexively moves.

I conclude by bringing these three specific spaces of identity practice together and suggest that the performance of everyday life elsewhere problematises identity. Rather than the simplistic performance of the ‘tourist’, the individual is found to simultaneously construct and perform multiple, often contested, identities. In centering daily life of the individual so the myth of tourism as the escape from everyday life is challenged.
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“Only a rationalised cell travels. A bubble of panoptic and classifying power, a module of imprisonment that makes possible the production of an order, a closed and autonomous insularity—that is what can traverse space and make itself independent of local roots.”

de Certeau (1984, pg. 111)

Chapter One: Introducing a thesis

Through this thesis I explore daily life experienced ‘elsewhere’. I do so by engaging in an analytic auto-ethnographic investigation of everyday life. One that evolved out of my encounters and interactions with social actors (human and non-human) that occurred in the context of socially constructed tourist spaces – more particularly a fully inclusive group tour. The purpose of this study is to examine how the practice of everyday life performed elsewhere (away from home) informs the construction of one’s identity. As such, this thesis was, and is, informed not only by my engagement with academic discourse, but also through my attempts to (re)construct and perform a reflexive self. This has been directed, in no small part, through critical engagement with my ‘own’ lived history, including intimate engagements with the ‘production’ and ‘consumption’ of tourism and hospitality experiences that were a part of my daily (working and leisure) life for some 20 years.

Recently, attention has turned to the suggestion of tourism as an everyday activity in 21st century western society (Haldrup and Larsen, 2009). However, what might be considered the banal practices that make up the everyday performances of the

1 Whilst I consider it my own life – it can never truly be my ‘own’ as it is formed and performed in conjunction with other social actors; it is contingent upon the world around me (Berger and Luckmann, 2007).
individual-as-tourist\(^2\) have been largely overlooked. It can be suggested that this is a result of the taken-for-grantedness of mundane performances in which we all play a part but which are often practiced unreflexively (Gardiner, 2000). Likewise, as I discuss below, these performances are often seen as central to the support activities provided to the individual-as-consumer, with research focused upon managerial and economic concerns.

The question then becomes, how might those activities that are normally carried out by many of us, in spaces we socially construct and inhabit on a daily basis, challenge and make problematic what might be suggested as certain ideological identities that arise in the context of tourism? Here I include binary performances such as buyer/seller, us/other, tourist/local, host/guest, consumer/producer. These are just a small number of the multiple and contested identities that make up tourism as a social imaginary, but that I contend are subject to the constraints and freedoms presented by daily life performed elsewhere\(^3\).

In the following sections of this chapter I set out to provide background for the thesis. This includes key concepts such as the reflexive self, everyday life and (im)mobilities which, whilst discussed in depth in later chapters, are introduced here to provide context for the remainder of the thesis. The chapter concludes with a brief overview of the remainder of the thesis.

---

\(^2\) My objective here is not to define, or even argue what a tourist is, there are literatures too numerous to mention that deal with this rather contentious topic (see for example Franklin and Crang’s problematisation of the ‘tourist’). Rather, I embrace Alneng’s (2002) positioning of the ‘idea’ of the tourist as posited upon and contingent to a particular (and individual) worldview that subsequently makes the world available for touristic consumption. Thus I use the word ‘tourist’ as a rhetorical device in order to allow a differentiation of myself as subject (and object) of enquiry. Indeed this very argument might also be said to apply to the positioning and identity of my-self as researcher.

\(^3\) More often than not the tourist is considered as moving away from ‘home’. However I find this to be somewhat simplistic, as it does not deal with the complexities of home as a social and cultural construct. As such, throughout this thesis I also make use of the idea of the individual as being elsewhere when engaged in tourism. Elsewhere can be considered in the context of both the body and/or mind. In order to communicate the contested nature of ‘home’ I use inverted commas.
1.1 Background

In this section I introduce the objectives of the research, the field and location of the research and an outline of the methods used. Although these are dealt with in detail in later chapters (see chapter 3), in giving you, the reader, an introduction to these aspects I will provide sufficient background to allow for an understanding of why this thesis takes the form that it does.

In this thesis I initially wanted to explore how people, as social actors, encountered and performed both with others and material culture, in a particular type of space, commonly regarded as being emblematic of away, but also promoted paradoxically as ‘home’; the hotel. This was, after all, the space of my previous everyday working life, one that had generated my questioning in the first place. Over the course of the research however, I found that the spaces outside of the hotel, those that I uncritically thought of as ‘exotic’, came to present opportunities for me to reflexively attend to my search for knowledge. Through encounters and ‘meetings’ with others, I was able to problematise the dichotomous identities that I/we uncritically perform. This in turn encouraged me to challenge the taken-for-grantedness, the supposed banality of performances of everyday life, such as eating, drinking, sleeping, and washing clothes. Thus my interest became to not merely seek to understand what the everyday is, but also why and how it is performed and made meaningful, and as a result how such practices might challenge our understanding of the ‘tourist’.

Through this thesis I write of and about (and through) the banal practices of everyday life as a way to disrupt the notion of tourism as an exotic performance of escape from everyday life. In foregrounding those unarticulated spaces of the banal, performed away from home, I argue that the practice of tourism is not one of disembodied and highly structured performance, rather it is a performative accomplishment. Everyday life away from home was shown to be an assembly of performative encounters – with each other
and with the spaces we (co)constructed that were both affective and embodied. It was everyday life as a performative assembly (rather than, for example, consumer performance) that created a kind of touristic eventness (Adey, 2006), one in which it was the everyday experiences that were rendered memorable.

Throughout the thesis I show that using mobile and performative methodologies offers new insights into tourist practices and the construction of identity. For example, rather than the tourist as an external performance it is a performative accomplishment inherently tied up in the practice of everyday life. As such, rather than everyday life as something that is escaped from, it is rendered as creative praxis. Additionally I challenge the positionality of the researcher investigating the tourist as social actor. Rather than looking in at the tourist on the one hand or, on the other, following the tourist I show that there is value in understanding both being (becoming) and being-with the tourist. Thus I seek to advance academic knowledge by bringing theories of everyday life into contact with the (empirical) realities of life on the road for a group of tourists.

1.1.1 Objectives

The fundamental question this research investigated was:

How does the practice of everyday life performed elsewhere (away from home) inform the construction of one’s identity?

Through the focus on a specific, socially constructed touristic space, the fully inclusive group tour, I sought to understand:

How the collective and individual experience of the tour as a socially constructed space mediated identity?

What I want to suggest here is that the mediation, construction and performance of tourism spaces needs to be understood through everyday practices. In understanding
touristic experiences through the banal, so tourism and everyday life are revealed as having a dialectic relationship, in turn problematising current mythologizing of tourism as the exotic and/or other.

Whatever the rationale behind the phenomenon of tourism, the corporeal and ephemeral characteristics of tourism when considered as an ‘escape’ from the everyday presents unique challenges to the researcher, especially when the enquiry is centred on the (relocated) performances of what are perceived as everyday activities. Additionally, many of these practices are often performed within the domestic sphere and thus are shut away from the outside world and attendant surveillance(s); including from the prying eyes of the researcher (Pink, 2012b, Scott, 2009). In order to achieve my objective an imperative was to make the familiar strange and to (re)sensitise myself to the banal and mundane aspects of daily life. Thus in undertaking this thesis my attention turned to exploring the micro-sociological performances of the ‘tourist’ and the relationship or interconnectedness between these performances and daily life away from ‘home’. As these performances do not exist outside of space and time the thesis implicates these performances in the (social) construction of space. In order to achieve this I engaged dialogically with tourists to co-construct a more-than-representational understanding of the overlooked banal practices, performances and spaces that are a part of the fully inclusive tour group.

1.1.2 Field(s) of Practice (why a coach tour)

Hotels can be lonely places. Surrounded by staff and other tourists, one can feel as alone as if one was stranded on an island. Having worked for many years in tourism and commercial hospitality businesses, my initial thoughts were that I would be able to observe and analyse performances of everyday life through understanding the hotel as a socially constructed space. However it was during this process that I quickly came to realise that merely sitting, as Robert Park (Prus, 1996, pg. 119) suggested, “in the lounges of the luxury hotels” would not allow me access to micro-sociological
performances of the everyday life of others. For example, the temporal and spatial characteristics of the hotel result in a particular staged performance of interactions (Goffman, 1967, Goffman, 1973). Whilst I could hope for serendipitous encounters, I was not prepared to leave the research to fate.

At the time I was thinking about how I might best develop a site of enquiry, a friend and colleague returned from carrying out his own thesis fieldwork; an ethnography of sports tourists participating in a (specialist) tour group (Wright, 2011). Unfortunately, the group context of his planned trip did not eventuate, and he was left having to re-think his fieldwork. This, however, encouraged me to think about how I might use the concept of a group of individuals on holiday as a central component of my data collection phase. Thinking about escorted tours in particular, I realised that they would allow me a richness of data, given the time spent together (Meged, 2010, Larsen and Meged, 2013), that I would not be able to access merely by observing people in hotel environments. Choosing a fully inclusive group tour (henceforth FIGT) was a (pragmatic) result of my need to understand the social investments individuals, including myself, make in performance of the everyday by exploring particular texts and practices (Bourdieu, 1977).

In immersing myself within a FIGT my hope was that it would lead to multiple opportunities for intersubjective, dialogic and performative encounters. That being said, I want to clarify that the FIGT itself, as a phenomenon, is not the focus of the research⁴, rather it is presented in this thesis as a context in which I explore daily life. By using a FIGT I was able to look at the meanings specific texts, rhythmic and non-rhythmic practices and performances held for those of us on the tour. In situating the package tour as a lens through which to ‘see’ and situate the everyday it allowed me to develop

⁴ However, see chapter five for how everyday life on tour leads to the formation of a kind of community.
insights into how banal practices relate to identity practices, one’s sense of self as well as to social relations.

Mobility is central to an understanding of the everyday in this thesis; from the suggested agency of one’s luggage (Walsh and Tucker, 2009), how we sit (or don’t) in the coach, to the practice(s) of going to the toilet. In the epigraph to this chapter de Certeau (1984) makes use of the train as a bounded and regulated mobile space (containing immobile passengers) in turn suggesting an interiorising of the rationalised self that travels. In a similar way I make use of the FIGT. In the context of this thesis, it is de Certeau’s suggestion that in order to travel one must be ‘rationalised’. The key here is the suggestion of a subsequent loss of both identity, and importantly agency. However, and as I go onto explain throughout the thesis, whilst I understand the coach as an interiorising space, rather than the distinction between the “immobility of the inside and that of the outside” (de Certeau, 1984, pg. 112), along with the complete rationalisation of the individual, I will argue the coach is a space of multiple, intensive and affective (im)mobilities. For me it is the embodied performance(s) of the FIGT that constituted the multiple social spaces which in turn ordered the activities of the (present and absent) social actors and indeed the wider assemblage that makes up the FIGT.

Of course in order to represent\(^5\) the coach I needed to consider it, at least initially, as being intrinsically mobile whilst those inside, the passengers, were thought of as being inherently immobile (Thrift, 2008). However, the coach provided more than physical movement through space. Indeed the coach offered opportunities to interact in and make observable shared, culturally constructed and implicit knowledges that frequently shaped and mediated our everyday practice(s) in highly localised ways (Johnson et al,

---

\(^5\) Whilst I make use of representation here (Hall, 1997), I go further and argue the crisis of representation in chapter 2.
2004). Within this thesis, (im)mobilities performed in the context of the socio-spatial become primary interpretive threads.

1.1.3 Introducing methods/ology

Engaging in a methodology that ‘forced’ an awareness of the researcher self, and indeed places the researcher as subject alongside the tourist allowed me to not only gain access but to also engage in what became meaningful intersubjective encounters. However primacy is not given to my voice, either as researcher or as subject of research. Rather it was through paying heed to my own embodied and affective encounters with others that I was able to understand what is was to perform everyday life away from home. Fundamentally engaging with reflexive methodologies enabled me to deal with issues of ethics (after all I was also researching my-self, see Chapter Three, but to also establish empathetic relationships that I would not have been able to do if researching in more established and/or conservative ways. In saying the above, when I deal with the more philosophical aspects of the thesis, including epistemological concerns, my voice does come to the fore. The methodology of the thesis must necessarily touch upon the subjectivities of the researcher and, after all, the philosophy of knowledge, or how I come to know, is inherently subjective. But to reiterate, when it comes to my discussion of those encounters with others my voice becomes but one within the community – there to tell the story and offer interpretation but not to be or become the story.

In this thesis, as with Myers (2010, pg. 376), “my conceptions of the world, my identity within it, and the baggage of these things inevitably carry over into my research”. As I have both lived (as employee and customer), and worked in tourist places over a substantial period of time, I cannot engage with and interpret the spaces and performances of this research without the affect of those (past) lived experiences being implicated in the endeavour. I need to point out that I do temper this by exploring interactions with both notable others (the group), and others outside the group, as well as the uniqueness of the places through which the tour progressed. In this thesis, I
wanted to attend to Ren, Pritchard and Morgan’s (2010) call to understand “tourism research as a heterogeneous and continuously negotiated entity, both creating and challenging the constant production of discourses of knowledge, usefulness and positions of insiders and outsiders, protagonists and adversaries”. In offering a particularly situated voice, as both researcher and subject, I will argue (see chapters two and three) it “better captures the fractured, contradictory and context-rich social world” (Botterill, 2007, pg. 124), of daily life performed by the individual-as-tourist.

1.2 Making the personal political: beginnings of a reflexive self

In this section my aim is not to engage specifically with academic literature (see section 1.3) or even the construction of (new) knowledge. Rather, by providing background knowledge about the subject matter of this thesis I aim to provide a wider, more personal context which will give you, the reader, an indication of the function of reflexive ethnographic understanding(s). This is important to me; after all, accounts of lived performance space are necessarily messy and reflexive ethnography is no different. As William Foote-Whyte’s (1943) landmark social ethnography *Street Corner Society* illustrated, the capturing and (re)telling of stories along with analysis of such data is subject not only to the vagaries of the researcher’s immersion in the field but also influenced by the background and history of the researcher(s) themselves. I also find it interesting that Foote-Whyte’s inclusion of his personal background, included in the appendices, predates by a number of decades the contemporary understanding of the role of authorial voice/position within the text, something I discuss further in chapter two.

Given the messiness that is the outcome of personal involvement in the construction of knowledge, it is somewhat of a paradox that it has also been argued that this centering of the author is nothing more than a trend within ethnography (Dyck, 2010). Dyck goes further to suggest there should be a resistance to “any form of mandatory declaration of
and registration” (pg. 163) of the stories and memories that might inform and indeed influence the ethnography. Nevertheless, given that a particular narrative of this thesis is reflexivity with its attendant focus on subjects-in-becoming (Lyle, 2009), it is important for me to acknowledge such becoming’s do not begin with the thesis clearly demarcated as a point of departure. As such, and pre-empting any claims of self-indulgence, I wish, in the following paragraphs, to engage in a period of what Sparkes (Sparkes, 2002, pg. 210) suggests as “self-knowing”. I do this by providing a small part of my lived history, which has had substantial influence over the research topic and moreover, informs my research in the field (Rose, 2004).

1.2.1 Me, My-self, I
In the process of disclosing (my)self I am acutely aware of the criticism of particular types of reflexive ethnography whereby disclosing the self in an unselfconscious manner often appears as mere spectacle (Goslinga and Frank, 2007). As such my purpose in revealing myself is to involve you, the reader, in what I hope is at the very least a move towards a dialogical encounter with the contents of this thesis and its author, me. It is in the following sections that I acknowledge and situate the multiplicity of voices, and plurality of my ‘selves’ and those (significant) others with whom I interact (Lahire, 2011), and who are therefore complicit in the construction of this thesis.

1.2.2 Beginnings
As I was part way through planning this chapter I was trying to think through how I might discuss the impact my previous ‘lives’ have had on the topic, methods and issues that are central to this section (and) to the thesis. Rather serendipitously, The Eagles began playing in the background. Listening to the song (Hotel California), and reminiscing, I realised that the lyrics were resonating with many of the ideas that I had been struggling to elucidate. How can I enter a field if I have the feeling I have never left? How can I relate my past as a hotel manager with my self-as-becoming a researcher, attempting to look at touristic spaces and attendant performances objectively? After all
can one ever look at, or come to understand anything objectively? Moreover, given the opprobrium my significant other communicates whenever I start analysing everyday experiences, how can I distance my identity and performance as researcher from that of my everyday self (if I even have one self)? When I first became aware (and now secretly a fan) of The Eagles in the late 1970’s, I was at the same age as many of the undergraduate students I now teach. At the time I had no idea I would ever contemplate a thesis let alone just how much these lyrics would both inspire and, crucially, resonate throughout both the material and physical dimensions of the ideas I discuss in this chapter (and of course the wider thesis).

The lyrics spoke (and still speak), poetically, to a world I have inhabited and to a greater or lesser degree still do. Whilst one is born into the world as equal, the spatial and temporal aspects of culture and society soon work to shape the baby-as-body from primarily a biological organism into the human as social being. In acknowledging these social and cultural influences upon the individual it becomes an imperative, for me at least, to make the personal political. Thus in thinking about and writing down particular aspects of my past (and imagined future) I wonder if in undertaking the thesis journey I might find a way to, metaphorically as well as literally, escape my past. I am hopeful that it will at the very least allow me to make some sense of it.

My everyday working life was, for a period of 20 plus years, focused on enabling the tourist to perform the banalities of the everyday whilst away from home. From kitchen hand to food and beverage manager to hotel manager, I have been involved in providing products and services that have allowed the continuity of touristic daily life; food and drink, a place to sleep; safety and security needed for everyday life. In hindsight, the methodologies and methods I employed (see chapters two and three) in the search for new knowledge were in place long before I began the process of this thesis. I am mindful that in producing this thesis I have become aware that a researcher identity has been a core part of my performance(s) of self for most of my adult life. I have never really taken
a holiday from this part of my being. Experiences of travel and hospitality, for both work and leisure, have become an intrinsic part of my life. These, of course, have subsequently manifested themselves within this thesis. These memories that I will draw upon have come from what Bakhtin (1981) terms a ‘long drawer’; a repository within which I have stored memories and notes, along with other artefacts. These memories, considered either consciously or unconsciously, exist as past experiences that I have been able to draw upon for this thesis (Venables, 2003).

At this point I want to acknowledge that I am a western, middle class, Anglo-Saxon male. I consider myself, if only on reflection, as privileged in both my leisure and work lives. At the time of beginning this thesis I had spent the previous two decades employed within the hotel and hospitality sectors. Whilst beginning my career back-of-house washing pots and pans, which certainly then did not appear to be privileged, my social and cultural background enabled me to progress in a way that many others within the industry were and remain unable to. This included not only promotion to senior management positions, but also the ability to use my career choice as an enabler for international travel. Given both my cultural heritage as well as my ability to perform, including here my gender, within the social spaces of the international hotel I was able to spend a good part of my working life as an hotelier outside of New Zealand, the country of my birth.

As I introduced earlier, my initial thoughts on an appropriate setting for this thesis revolved around reflections on how I understood the hotel spaces in which I worked and slept. I found myself increasingly reflecting upon the extent to which my own hitherto unthinking performance, as both producer and consumer of hotels, was influenced by other social actors as much as the hotel itself. As such I began to become increasingly

---

*Many of my management positions required me to, every second night, sleep in a guest room within the hotel, eat in the restaurant(s) and drink in the bar(s). In effect (and affect) my job required me to ‘be the tourist’.*
curious as to the social performances of others in the hotel and what they were actually engaged in. In order to give background to this thesis I want to share two specific memories that acted to influence the research and subsequent objectives of this thesis. The first one concerns my initial foray into hotel management some 25 years ago in the city in which I was born and raised, Dunedin in the South Island of New Zealand, and relates to what I now understand as socially constructed space.

I still remember the feelings (and thoughts) walking past the hotel, which at the time was the major competitor (and indeed remains one of the city’s premier hotels, and one in which I found myself as acting general manager some 20 years later, see plate 1.1), to the hotel in which I then held my first management position.

Plate 1.1 Hotel Facade

The hotel I was walking past fronted what was then a busy pedestrian thoroughfare with its frontage and main access situated directly adjacent to the footpath. The front of the hotel, which inhabited much of a city block, consisted of some 200m of glass. I vividly remember standing outside the hotel feeling unable to enter due to my perceptions of it as a place for others; those with money and status, who belonged, who were ostensibly

---

7 As I discuss in detail in chapter three I use images as data, as aide memoire and as representations in their own right.
from elsewhere. In short, the characteristics of identities that I felt at the time were absent from my own everyday lived experience. Thus the interior of this particular hotel was a space in which I had no place. For me the hotel importantly displaced me. It existed both socially and materially as a place of otherness, a place from which I was effectively and affectively excluded. It was not until some twelve years later whilst working in a leading resort hotel in Scotland that I was to come to terms with the performances and encounters in such spaces.

The resort hotel, situated some 90 miles from Edinburgh is considered one of the leading resort hotels in the world. During my time working at this hotel I never entered the hotel itself via the main entrance, even though I was a manager at a satellite operation and was required to deliver the days ‘takings’ into the main hotel at the end of my shift, albeit through an underground tunnel that hid my egress and exit from public (customer) view. It was not until my father came across from New Zealand to visit and I went to enter the hotel via the main, somewhat grand (including Dorman and flamboyant Scottish regalia), entrance for the first time that I began to reflect on what made such spaces. My attempts to subsequently rationalise the embodied and affective conflict I felt at that moment encouraged me to think about how such spaces are constructed and mediated by our everyday lives, including our performances and of those with whom we interact.

The second instance of my engagement in the tourist world relates more specifically to performances and encounters within touristic space. The focus here is more specifically about my subsequent problematizing of those individuals, including myself, who produce and consume such spaces. It is somewhat ironic that I have chosen an aspect of mass tourism, the FIGT (Obrador-Pons et al., 2009a), through which to explore everyday life. For much of my adult life I have viewed myself as a ‘backpacker’. I had actively performed many of the criteria that are suggested to make up this particular travelling individual (Duncan, 2007). I have travelled on a budget; I was highly mobile; I actively resisted being categorised as any type of tourist. Until very recently I had never owned a suitcase. The nature of my career, along with regularly occurring encounters that at the
time appeared serendipitous and resulted in either promotions or job offers, more often than not in different parts of a country or the world, resulted in me living a somewhat peripatetic lifestyle. To me home was wherever I found myself, and was often manifest through my backpack lying in the corner – ready to go at a moment's notice. Indeed this is something I still find myself doing, albeit with a semi unpacked suitcase with wheels (see chapter seven). Thus throughout both my working and leisure life the group tour was something to be avoided; in fact in many ways they were the bane of much of my working life.

I remember my first ever hotel management position, a new suit, young and ambitious. No matter the trappings, my first job was to carry luggage to and from tour group coaches, in the process becoming hot, sweaty and increasingly annoyed with what at the time seemed like the herd mentality of those tourists with whom I was interacting. In the evenings it was my job to jump on board the coach and welcome the tourists to the city and our hotel as their home-for-the-night. In the mornings it was again my job to board the coach and say goodbye to those same tourists whose bags I had just carried downstairs. Somewhat surprisingly, in the following fifteen years of working abroad, I cannot once remember having dealt with coach tours in a similar way. It was not until returning to my homeland that tour groups, as both group and individual, again impacted upon my life. There is one particular moment that on reflection guided my choice of subject matter/enquiry that had as its direct outcome, this thesis.

I had been working in a 4 star hotel in one of New Zealand’s key resort towns. In the summer peak period we would, on average, receive six coachloads of mainly international (fully inclusive group) tourists from various parts of the world. As food and beverage manager I was tasked with ensuring that all of these tourists, plus others that were not part of group tours, were fed and watered. Much of my operational focus was on delivering what the organisation and I considered to be the products and services required by these tourists-as-consumers. This took the form of what might be considered
the expected standard of restaurant experiences at this level; restaurant menus both a la Carte and table d’hôte, consisting of food seen to be representative of place (e.g., New Zealand lamb), extensive wine lists and professional service. In addition, there were traditional, ‘authentic’ dining experiences including indigenous groups from the local community performing for the tourist.

The defining moment, or what I consider the genesis of this thesis is firmly lodged in my memory. Whilst I was standing at the door to one of the restaurants watching the staff working/producing as well as customers eating/consuming I had what in hindsight was my personal eureka moment – albeit one that generated questions rather than answers. I knew that the people in the restaurant, the customers, were eating. However what identities and activities were they performing? Most of them had been on the road for at least two weeks; eating in hotel restaurants at both breakfast and dinner. How did that impact on their perceptions of the space(s) that they were eating in and what meanings did they ascribe to, and take from, the food (and experiences) they were consuming? It was at this point that I began to question what I was actually involved in. After all, eating is part of our everyday life, and this must necessarily be maintained whilst away from home, no less so than when one is a tourist.

My focus in thinking about these moments is the (dis)appearance of the banal. Both the spaces and performances, whilst ostensibly about tourism, were located in the performance of everyday life. The hotel, for example, acts a space of daily work and thus of the everyday life of staff, but also over time becomes a space of the production and reproduction of the everyday life of the tourist. It is in the hotel that one eats, sleeps and washes. However, tourist spaces such as the hotel along with the tour coach are represented as amorphous spaces. Here performance seems to be predominantly acknowledged through a market orientation, where the encounter is about the efficiencies driven by an economic discourse - one where agency of the social actor, if it exists, is predicated on their role as consumer. Likewise, to all intents and purposes the
restaurant becomes a stand in for one’s breakfast bar or dining room at home. On reflection these instances worked in unison to encourage me to think past my own prejudices of this type of travel, the coach tour, and stereotypes promulgated not only through various media sources but also formulated by my limited critical engagement with and understanding of space. How, for example, do we actually make sense of and perform everyday life away from home? As the coach tour became a space that generated questions so then it became a space in and through which I wanted to find answers.

The beginning of an awareness of self, combined with an early reading of Julie Harrison’s (2003) text on Being a Tourist, encouraged me to think of my own experiences as a tourist, but possibly more importantly to search for ways I might come to know the tourist. From an intellectual standpoint, Nigel Thrift’s early thoughts on alternatives to representation and his later text Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect (2008) encouraged me to think of the possibilities that existed beyond representation. I was affected by the way ideas and theories were drawn and synthesised from diverse fields of enquiry such as performance studies, cultural studies, sociology and human geography. These works subsequently enabled me to rationalise, and indeed operationalize, seemingly divergent ways of thinking, and further allowed me the (self) confidence to explore and seek knowledge in particularly embodied, affective and reflexive ways. I now want to turn to a discussion of key concepts that inform the narrative within the thesis.

1.3 Engaging with literature

At this stage I need to point out that the structure of my thesis does not follow the sequence of knowledge production found in what might be considered traditional theses. Considerable deliberation went into how I would (rather than should) structure this thesis. Of course convention dictates a particular structure, however whilst attuned to the importance of tradition I felt that such structure did not offer me the opportunity (or
agency) to fully engage in my chosen methodologies (see section 1.3.1) Thus in the following discussion I seek to pre-empt responses to not having a traditional literature review chapter.

As Dobson (2014) says of traditional structure, there is potential to take for granted such traditional mechanisms as the literature review “because they seem so logical” but that we forget that “they actually shape and mediate our findings and our experiences in ways we are no longer able to see. We write using this structure and we think we have found something and that we have found something that no-one else has seen, but really we’ve not seen much at all” (Dobson, 2014, pg.22). Rather than focusing on a systemic in-depth review of the literature prior to engagement with the empirical, I include the literature where it does justice to my exploration and interpretation of the data. Thus whilst I have not included a formal literature review in one specific chapter I do not want this to imply I have not reviewed the literature in depth.

My critical engagement with the literature did not happen at one particular point in the thesis, rather I engaged with the literature prior to, during and post field work. As such, and in keeping with my fluid (and contingent) commitment with literature my review of the literature is not confined to a specific chapter. Rather I wanted to tease out a conceptual framework that could be critically constructed as the literature unfolded throughout the thesis (Venables, 2003). Moreover in keeping with being more-than-representational I wanted this to disrupt the traditional representational characteristic of literature analysis. The literature and empirical discussion are necessarily co-constitutive; that is for me they are subject to consideration as a relational ontology (van Inwagen, 2011). As such in this thesis I consider it more epistemologically sound to give the literature a sense of agency and in doing so actively work into the wider discussion. Whilst not having a chapter with the literature as its focus, following Suominen (2003), I use the literature separately, in each chapter and section, to study each particular theme that emerged from my initial analysis of the data (please see section 3.6). Discussion of
the literature thus appears in what might be considered the ‘normal’ places rather than as bound together in one discussion of the concepts used within the thesis (Dobson, 2014). In saying that concepts drawn from the literature are pulled together in Chapter Seven.

I did not go into the field unduly influenced by the extant literature, I remained aware of Fetterman’s (2010, pg. 1) suggestion that I ought “to enter the field with an open mind not an empty head”. Moreover, what I read was shaped by what I (have) experienced and what I write (Dobson, 2014). This chapter (Chapter One) has therefore allowed me to layer different (traditional) components of the thesis enabling me to include elements of the literature review in the introduction. Thus in the following section, and in order to give context to the remainder of the thesis, I want to situate the thesis as being more-than-representational, as well as introducing relationships between tourism and everyday life.

1.3.1 Foregrounding the more-than-representational project

I discuss issues of representation in Chapter Two, however at this point I want to situate this thesis as more-than-representational (Anderson and Harrison, 2010, Cadman, 2009, Carolan, 2008, Dewsbury, 2010, Dirksmeier and Helbrech, 2008, Thrift, 2008, Vannini, 2009b). To date, knowledge and meaning has been dominated by (textual) representations from and through the ocular and aural (please see section 2.4.2). However, as a response to the cultural turn in the social sciences, including cultural geography amongst others, there was (and is) a growing awareness of how such hegemonic representations needed to, and could be made problematic, by paying more attention to the rest of the human body (Latham and Conradson, 2003). Moreover it is suggested that particular aspects of knowledge, including the spatial are absent as a
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8 I engage with the more-than-representational throughout the empirical chapters, and engage with the literature in depth in those discussions.
result of this privileging of sight and speech (and indeed the written). Following Dirksmeier and Helbrech (2008, pg. 3) my use of “non-representational theory attempts to do two related things: firstly, to provide an ontology which takes mundane practices seriously and, secondly, to provide various means of amplifying the creativity of these practices through various performative methods.” Thrift (2004, pg. 433/4) suggests there is an increasing requirement that social scientists ought to “recognise the need to acknowledge the event-ness” and messiness, of the world, and importantly to recognise that we “live in a multi-verse, not a universe”. For me, such space(s) and “intersection[s], transfer[s], emergence[s] and paradox[es] are central to life” and in turn, to understanding the everyday life of the tourist. Thus rather than merely rid ourselves of representing or representations, (as the post modernists would have us do) we need instead, to re-visit these representations (please refer to 2.4.2 for a discussion on the issues of representation) through “action-orientated perspectives” (Soderstrom, 2005, pg. 14). In order to do so there is a need to engage with “performative methodologies which allow their participants equal rights to disclosure, through dialogical actions rather than texts, through relation[s] rather than representation” (Thrift, 2008, p. 148). Non-representational theory then dispenses with the notion that access to an ontology of being in the world is impossible; rather it suggests that attention should turn to “the flows of practices in time and in the presentations, which result from acting at the moment” (Dirksmeier and Helbrech, 2008, pg. 11)

Whilst not entirely embracing Thrift’s (2008) call for a non-representational theory I do embrace many of the ideas he puts forward. In this part of the section I want to specifically engage with ontologies of affect (Barnett, 2008) and aspects of performance that Thrift (2008) suggests need to be understood as a ‘spatial politics of affect’, situated in the practice of the everyday (Cadman, 2009). Central to my understanding and use of more-than-representational ideas is my engagement with (and through) the body, performance and emotions in the midst of both fieldwork and the production of this thesis.
Embracing the more-than-representational allowed me to engage with the everyday in a mobile way; for example, to view the performance of the banal as an embodied disposition (Cadman, 2009). In being (or becoming) more-than-representational, I was encouraged to think of embodiment as involving the interactions and encounters with other human and non-human beings and objects. Importantly, in thinking more-than-representationally, objects become more than mere backdrops. Rather, they become part of “hybrid assemblages, endowed with diffused personhood and relational agency” and as such were “given the same conceptual and empirical weight that is warranted to their human companions” (Vannini, 2009b, p. 284). This allowed me to draw attention to the sensuous, affective and performative possibilities of tourist encounters, with both human and material objects. Importantly this also included the performance (and performativity) of becoming (see chapters four and five).

I do take issue with Thrift (2008, p. 7) when he contends that, “non-representational theory is resolutely anti-biographical and pre-individual” as this precludes the knowing (and social) self. However, I take heart from Vannini’s (2009b) claim that reflexive ethnography fulfils the researcher’s claims of being more-than-representational through attending to “the playful, performative, sensual, expressive, and heteroglossic properties of the nonrepresentational paradigm” (p. 286). I would further suggest that by reflexively engaging with multiple (small scale) mobilities; in engaging with a more-than-representational sensibility, it encouraged my engagement with analytic-auto ethnography as a new and important way of (co-?)constructing knowledge in tourism studies. Importantly, such a way of knowing worked to challenge the dominance of representation and necessarily called for an understanding of the politics of (im)mobilities and the dynamics of both the representational and the more-than-representational (Blunt, 2007). Finally, attending to the more-than-representational provided me with a way to deal with the assumptions of representation inherent in the performance of everyday life. Thus rather than a focus on words, “understood as the "spoken words" of a discussion or the "written words" of documents of the research
context—including the analysis, interpretation, research and reception of the whole research process” (Dirksmeier and Helbrech, 2008, pg. 10/11) my focus became the performance of interaction. Important in this thesis were the encounters between and the blurring of, the researcher and the tourist (Laurier & Philo, 2006)

Through engaging with the more-than-representational I am also necessarily dealing with aspects of performance studies (Dirksmeier and Helbrech, 2008, Dewsbury, 2010). Whilst I give a further account of Erving Goffman’s ideas of performance in Chapter Two I want to briefly discuss how I make use of performance and performativity with the thesis.

Using performance as both metaphor and vector of enquiry is not new to tourism as a locus of enquiry (see e.g. Edensor, 2000, 2001; Coleman and Crang 2002). Speaking of representational performances, Urry and Larsen (2011, pg. 116), suggest that, for example “most tourist places have over time been inscribed with specific ‘imaginative geographies’ materialised and mobilised in and through...brochures” (see chapter four for further discussion). It is through such spaces, Urry and Larsen (2011, pg. 173) argue, that the tourist begins to engage with the potential of theatrical staging, “through which the consumer [might] enter imaginative touristscapes”. Understanding performance however necessitates a refocusing from the primacy of the ‘gaze’ (Urry, 2001) to how knowledge might be found in and through the myriad of interactions and encounters of touristic life. Whilst I have previously used the concept of performance and performativity in the chapter I want to clarify what these concepts mean in the context of this thesis.

According to Grimes (2003, pg. 35) performance is the “showing of a doing”. For Schechner (2006), the situations we find ourselves in, such as the banal activities of everyday life, are performances and moreover ones that are not always distinct from each other. That is, for example, the performance of eating can and does overlap with the
performance of identity (as I discuss in Chapter Six). Performance might also be considered an event that crosses the borders of everyday life – for example the suggestion that tourism is an exotic performance and thus in opposition to daily life at home (Obrador-Pons, 2003).

What I do not want to do is suggest a reductionist view of performance, where performance might almost become an unthinking re-action to structural concerns, for instance the consumer as dupe (Ritzer, 2003). Most importantly, I do not wish to conflate performance with performativity – something easily done (Dewsbury, 2000). Rather in this thesis I use performance as a metaphor to illustrate the development of an outlook where "[everday] life is theatre" to a view of "[everyday] life as a performance" (Thrift, 2000, pg. 225). Thus my attention, whilst attuned to performance considered within a system of representation or the processes of practice and performance (Dirksmeier and Helbrech, 2008), also looks to the outcomes of these performances.

Trying to tie down a meaning of/for performativity is difficult. To Dewsbury (2000, pg. 475) the “performative slips across, beyond, and through such actual renditions” of actual performance(s). Although a discrete act, the "performative is the gap, the rupture, the spacing that unfolds the next moment allowing change to happen” (Dewsbury, 2000, pg. 475). It is more than the outward ‘act’ of performance for an audience – for example the performance of the tour guide in announcing the next stop, to the tourist as audience (see Chapter Five and Six). The performative can be the utterance (Butler, 1997), the possibilities of the welcome to our hotel or the “actualization, [of] a series of practices … [that] does not provide blueprints, models, ideals, or goals. Rather, it experiments; it makes; it is fundamentally aleatory; it is bricolage” (Grosz, 1994a, pages 195/196). As such I want to, in thinking of performance, understand the everyday through “performative embodiment” (Harrison, 2000, pg. 504). Thus in Chapter Five when I talk of Vera (whom I sat beside throughout the trip) I am looking not only to her ‘scripted’
performance but also how her body does identity, an outcome that is often at odds with her intersubjective performance(s) with myself.

The possibilities of a performative understanding therefore calls me back to those unarticulated spaces that the more-than-representational seeks to foreground. In the context of this thesis refers to the neglected enactment not only of the social actor performing other-than-tourist but to also to how I consider the importance of encounters with material culture in constructing identity. To me, the question then becomes ‘what makes the everyday performance of identity performative’? Or, as Dirksmeier and Helbrech (2008, pg. ??) ask, “what makes the particular performance performative”? In asking these questions, as I will show, tourist identity is not really performance in a dramaturgical sense (see Chapter Two), rather it is a coming together of performative outcomes (Butler, 1999).

1.3.2 Linking tourism and Everyday Life

My intention in the following sections is to introduce and discuss the intersection of everyday life and tourism. I do this for two reasons; to give context to the thesis (as I have discussed earlier I this section) as well as to communicate the areas within the literature that provide opportunities for research and knowledge construction – the ‘gaps’ in the literature if you will (please also see 2.4.1 for opportunities for emergent methodologies in constructing new knowledge, and section 3.3 for fully inclusive group tours).

As a social phenomenon, tourism is often suggested as being about experiences that are antithetical to one’s everyday life (Leite and Graburn, 2009). Thus the performance of the tourist’s daily life is considered distinct from, and separate to, the banal aspects of the everyday life one might experience at ‘home’. Moreover, for Wearing and Law (Wearing and Law, 2013, pg. 280), it is the “ontological distinction between ‘away’ and ‘home’” that makes tourism a modern phenomenon”. However, as McCabe (2002)
suggests, little attention has been paid within tourism studies to “those aspects of everyday life that are sustained in tourist experiences” (pg. 61, my emphasis). There is an increasing attentiveness to how one might conceive of tourism practice as not only a modern activity within Western Society, but more importantly as an everyday activity (Urry, 1988), where being a tourist also, to a greater or lesser extent, involves the (re)production of cultures of ‘home’.

Such discourse(s) might be thought of as representing a banalisation of tourism (Haldrup, 2009), subsequently locating tourism as ordinary. However, given the objectives of this, for me it is the overlooked mundane and banal practices and performances hidden within the everyday performances of tourism (Haldrup and Larsen, 2009) which are of interest. It might be suggested that the micro-social aspects of the tourist’s everyday is overlooked as it is taken-for-granted. Everyday life is made up of practices we all perform but which, are more often than not, considered routine, static and unreflexive acts (Edensor, 2006, Edensor, 2001, Gardiner, 2000).

### 1.3.3 (Im)mobile bodies

The tourist, Dann (2002) writes, is a metaphor for a social world on the move. This is particularly relevant in an ever increasingly mobile, modern world where there has been increasing interest in mobilities and the everyday (Haldrup and Larsen, 2009). Much of this attention has been driven by a burgeoning interest in the so called mobilities paradigm (Hannam et al., 2006, Sheller and Urry, 2006). However, the focus of much of the use of the mobilities paradigm appears to have a macro temporal aspect which locates the (im)mobile social actor as a relatively longer term migrant in order to understand how various mobilities facilitate or otherwise, the maintenance of these particular individuals everyday lives (Conradson and Latham, Clarke, 2004a, Clarke, 2001).

---

9 Whilst much of the current literature deals specifically with the tourist as western and the toured as ‘other’ there is a recent move to understand the phenomenon of tourism (and being the ‘tourist’) from a non-western perspective – see Cohen and Cohen (2014) for example.
2004b, Blunt, 2007). In not engaging in understanding the wider (im)mobilities\(^\text{10}\) of tourism, specific (localised) spaces of knowledge and meaning have taken precedence and dominated what Haldrup and Larsen (2009, pg. 23) consider to be the "networked, mediated and distanced", aspects of the everyday world(s) that we inhabit.

Whilst there is an implicit acknowledgement of the mobile practices that enable tourism, much of the research and knowledge of the relationship between mobility and tourism has, as Hannam et al. (2006, p. 4) argue, "largely been for the social sciences a black box, a neutral set of technologies and processes predominantly permitting forms of economic, social and political life that are seen as explicable in terms of other, more causally powerful processes". As such a pervasive, essentialist knowledge and understanding of mobilities has, until very recently, dominated the tourism research agenda, including, for example, the movement of people to, between and from places or destinations. This essentialising of the tourist is further illustrated by the lack of attention to the everyday life practices that enable the performance of tourism, which, combined with traditional (ethnographic) methodologies has resulted in what has been suggested as an a-mobile knowledge of tourism (Haldrup and Larsen, 2009).

### 1.3.4 Tourism as mobility

Tourism, whilst in part being about drawing people in or pushing people out (Dann, 1977), and thus implicitly about physical movement, has had as its focus places as destinations (Cresswell, n.d.). Conversely, in this thesis I consider the tourist world as both de-placed and emplaced and given an element of order through different (im)mobilities (Conradson and Latham, 2005). In thinking about the relations between

\(^{10}\) I use (im)mobility to signify the contested nature of what I understand mobility to be. In this thesis to be immobile is not to imply stasis or fixity. Rather I think of mobilities as relational, as mobility only existing when intertwined with relative immobilities (Adey, 2006). Moreover these relations must be thought of as contingent. As such I use (im)mobility specifically to emphasise the necessary (contingent) relations between mobilities and im-mobilities as well as the differential nature of mobilities.
mobility and tourism I have drawn inspiration from James Clifford (1997) who theorises the idea of mobilities by thinking about the “everyday practices of dwelling and travelling: traveling-in-dwelling, dwelling-in-traveling” (1997, p. 36). To Clifford, whilst understanding the (tourist as) traveller as both privileged and subjugated, there is a suggestion that tourism itself is a kind of mobility which comprises “a range of material, spatial practices, that produce knowledges, stories, traditions, comportments, musics, books, diaries and other cultural expressions” (Clifford, 1997, p. 35).

However, Clifford hints at, but says little of, the actual practices and multiple (im)mobilities inherent in everyday life whilst performing travel. Nothing is said about the phone calls one makes ‘home’ when travelling nor of how one washes clothes or even sleeps at night. Likewise, for example of the performances of travelling-in-dwelling, those imagined mobilities; watching travel television programmes and looking at brochures and photo albums (Clarke, 2005). Such relationships between dwelling and travelling might be further problematised when one considers the dynamics inherent in the (possible) simultaneity of dwelling and travelling (see chapters five and six).

In the context of this thesis I want to consider tourism and mobility as being about more-than-corporeal movement. For me, (im)mobilities represent space(s) of encounter where the idea of the (tourist) body becoming mobile and subsequently coming to rest can be challenged by a more-than-representational understanding. An understanding “which stresses movement, both in terms of the many vicissitudes and sensory registers of travel-encounter and in terms of the stress on the movement-image” (Thrift, 2006, p. 141). Thus, I will suggest the multiplicity of mobilities informing the performance of the tourists’ everyday life offers the opportunity to recognise the multifarious and sensuous relationship between the tourist and how the tourist themselves becomes and is (im)mobile (Rodaway, 1994 and see chapter 6).
The mobilities paradigm then, has encouraged me to engage with the fluid and contingent nature of tourist performances. Moving past tourism as merely corporeal movement between the bordered (and ordered) spaces of home and away, to thinking of ‘constellations of mobilities’ in terms of the “motive force, speed, rhythm, route experience and friction” (Cresswell, 2010, pg. 18), that make up the (im)mobilities of the tourist’s everyday life.

1.3.5 Mobilities and rhythms
I have been writing of (im)mobilities, however I wish to acknowledge that mobility does not exist independent of temporalities. Lefebvre (2004), for example, uses the concept of time-space to explore the everyday, and in the process, engages mobilities as a mechanism to understand particular rhythms within everyday life.

In this thesis I follow Thrift’s (2008) argument for understanding the un-actualised possibilities of space-time. For Thrift (2008), what is important is the potential that is made possible through space-times that are unknown. Whilst we may not know these, they nevertheless consist of accompanying and rehearsed (hi)stories. Such (hi)stories, of lived life for example, become visible through technological challenges to space-time distanciation; where the faraway seems to be coming ever closer. Space-times, somewhat paradoxically, generate many of the un-actualised possibilities without which they themselves (space/time) cannot be sensed and described. Space-times, Thrift (2008 pg. 121) goes on to suggest, "very often provide the stutter in social relations, the jolt which arises from new encounters, new connections, new ways of proceeding". Finally, there is the suggestion that these mobile space-times are inexact and as a result leave clues to what was close to happening, but did not quite happen. As such they leave stories untold. For example the "body used for another purpose, or an aspect of the bodily stance that looks increasingly at odds with the world" (Thrift, 2008, pg. 121). For me, in the context of this thesis, such a way of thinking offers possibilities for new ways of knowing the tourist. An example of this, as I discuss in detail in chapter 4, is the engagement of an
individual’s imagination whilst immersed in the tourist brochure; through to hearing and sensing the soon to be filled coach seats or the empty hotel room that consists of manifold untold and hidden stories, as I discuss in chapter five.

A particular focus of rhythm in mobility can be understood by thinking of places as “ceaselessly (re)constituted by flows and never bounded or reified” (Edensor, 2010c). In this context rhythms can be thought of as constituted through the performance of various moorings and movements. For example, the rhythms apparent in the rush hour traffic commuters face when travelling to and from work (Lefebvre, 2004). Of particular relevance in this thesis is the stop - start - stop of the FIGT which can also represent the fortnightly beat of mass tourism (Obrador-Pons et al., 2009a).

Time and mobility then, can be thought of as implicit in the continuance of our daily lives, able to be viewed and understood through analysis of the performance(s) of ordinary everyday rhythms. This is, however, not to suggest such everyday rhythms are inherently stable (as I discuss in chapter 7). Rather I acknowledge these rhythms are open to destabilisation (Edensor, 2010c), and must be considered as necessarily mobile.

It is important to reaffirm, at this point, that the mobilities turn rather than seeking to do away with concepts of immobility, such as borders and boundaries and places, seeks to explore the possibilities of the overlapping spaces of movement and stillness. Thinking about mobilities encouraged me to reflect on human and material interactions (and interventions). Here, I was particularly interested in the opportunity mobilities offered to think through ideas such as proximity and distance; to look to the affective and performative possibilities offered by mobilities in exploring the mundane performances of the individual-as-tourist. After all, rhythms and routines within everyday life are not just to do with mobility but are equally manifest through what, on the surface, appear to be periods and spaces of stillness and mooring. For example, where one sits on the coach
or where and when one goes to the toilet or eats lunch are by the same token, implicated in (im)mobile everyday performances of the individual’s body.

For tourism, the mobile and immobile realities of the contemporary world allowed me the opportunity to consider how I might (re)configure “bodies, subjectivities and sensibilities” (Obrador-Pons, 2003, p. 48). In so doing I was able to attend to the material and imaginative connections of the tourist performance of the everyday (yet to be). That being said, I could also turn to the more prosaic practicalities of being (im)mobile. As such I could also think of mobility as “the ordinary and everyday achievement of planning and organising co-presence with other people and material objects such as tables, chairs and occasionally also cake” (Peters et al., 2010, p. 349).

### 1.3.6 Understanding the everyday

Tourism is often suggested as being a performance that provides a panacea to the daily trials and tribulations of individuals living in (late) modern society (Smith et al., 2010a). Certainly if one is to think of the tourism system as existing within the (mass) culture industries (Adorno et al., 2001), then it follows that tourism as both phenomenon and industry sets itself outside the realms of production, rather promoting and selling its products and services “as ‘freedom’ from the drudgery of the everyday” (Gunster, 2000, p. 46). Yet given the overarching need for ontological security - the ability to make sense of and exist in the world (Giddens, 1991, Gardiner, 2000), neither tourism, nor tourists, can ever truly escape the practicalities of everyday life. To me ontological security is important within this thesis as it speaks to the commodification of everyday life that, in turn, facilitates the industrialisation of the tourist experience thus enabling the corporeal mobilities of the masses. Whilst there are of course existential threats to our identity and selves - our existential security is to all intents and purposes achieved through our position as citizen consumers. In terms of existential/ontological distinction, “existential security” might be thought of as the continued existence of a referent object, for example the state or society (Buzan et al., 1998). Conversely, ontological security relates to the
implicit understanding that the normal worlds are as they appear to be, including the basic existential parameters of self and social identity (Giddens, 1984).

Our identity as modern tourists produces social dislocation as we move from here to ‘there’. It is in such spaces that we are subject to uncertainty and insecurity, thus threatening ontological security, which provides opportunities for discord between ourselves as well as the toured other. It is moreover, such conflict that challenges the tourism system. Existential security for me, in the context of this thesis, works at the macro-level, however my focus in this thesis is on the micro-social performance of daily life.

The routines of our (western) everyday lives are becoming increasingly globalised (Moran, 2005); from the ability to read The London Times wherever one has access to appropriate technology through to the ‘English’ breakfast offered by hotels around the globe. These and a myriad of what are perceived of as banal spatial practices of the everyday, act to ensure continuity and social cohesion. How we understand the everyday within the context of space is important. As Merrifield (1999, p. 347) argues, it is the “realm that reinforces routine, normalization and reproduction” of our daily lives, both at ‘home’ or away from ‘home’. Thus, in this thesis, the everyday lends itself as a space of inquiry – a space where “practice and representation are complexly interrelated, where lived reality of the quotidian co-exists with clichés, mythologies [and] stereotypes...” (Moran, 2005, pg. 13).

Whilst I can think of space as both producing and organising identity, I want to also think through those silenced spaces of tourism, the banal and mundane, to problematise representations of what Gaenzle (2006, p. 15) considers are “ordinary, scarcely articulated” spatial performances. Such spaces have as, Latham (2008 pg. 72) argues, resulted in a reification of the everyday as a “pure, pristine realm heroically unbowed by the grubby domination of the powerful”. Banal and mundane performance(s) as
unarticulated spaces come about, as Schutz (1967) suggests, because “everyday life exists as a paramount reality, a pre-constituted world that is necessarily taken-for-granted and viewed as a quasi-natural, unalterable horizon of action” (in Gardiner, 2000, p. 5). This might be attributed to the ordering and maintenance of daily life required to minimise risk to the self; what we don’t know won’t hurt us! As such, and somewhat paradoxically, the tourist’s daily life becomes made ‘safe’ and given order, by a replication of the mundane unthinking practices of ‘home’, made possible (at least in part) through the normative power of neo-liberal economic practices.

Given the importance of the everyday, it is of note that little attention is paid to everyday life by tourism academics11. It seems as if the modern western consumer as an elite is unproblematically able to escape their everyday lives. As a result, in today’s world, everyday life becomes a contest between understanding states of fixity and those of permanent flux, where the “opportunities of habit become the enemy of opportunities” (Felski, 1999/2000). As an example, MacCannell, (1999, pg. 159) offers a particularly structuralist ontology of tourism, where,

[e]veryday life threatens the solidarity of modernity by atomising individuals and families into isolated local groupings that are not functionally or ideologically interrelated. But everyday life is composed of souvenirs of life elsewhere.

He goes further, questioning our understanding of the meaningfulness of everyday whereby,

[t]he dialectics of authenticity insure the alienation of modern man even within his domestic contexts. The more the individual sinks into everyday life, the more he is reminded of reality and authenticity elsewhere.

11 Notable exclusions include Haldrup and Larsen (2009), and Obrador Pons et al. (2009).
When the everyday life of the tourist is considered, there is dominance of economic and managerial discourse(s). More often than not these are constructed from the ideologies that frame activities in such industries as hospitality and transport. This however leads to the essentialising of the mobile individual’s everyday life - interpreting and understanding the everyday as a homogeneous totality. The focus of research into the everyday then becomes how our understanding of the maintenance of the “taken-for-granted continuum of mundane activities” (Felski, 1999/2000, p. 15) might make possible our forays into the supposedly exotic world of travel and importantly, ensure benefit for tourism as an economic institution.

Privileging an economic/managerial discourse however, is to suggest the everyday as an inherently unreflexive practice. Within the study of tourism this is certainly reflected in Edensor’s (2001) assertion that an understanding of the everyday might be captured by the habits and routines of the individual. The performance of the tourist is, as Edensor (2001 pg. 61) postulates, “never entirely separate from the habits of everyday life, since they are unreflexively embodied in the tourist”. Thus the tourist can be positioned as performing habitual and routine activities in a common sense manner. In contrast, within this thesis I locate the touristic everyday as incorporating what might be considered a depth reflexivity, encompassing both “discursive and pre-discursive, embodied qualities” (Gardiner, 2000, pg. 6). Rather than treating the everyday as familiar, in order to achieve the objectives of the thesis I need to make it strange. By doing so I think of the banal and mundane activities of the tourists as presenting “a problematic, a contested and opaque terrain, where meanings are not to be found readymade” (Highmore, 2002b, pg. 1).

1.3.7 Defining the everyday

Trying to define everyday life is fraught with difficulty. The very taken-for-grantedness of the everyday, and the appearance of the habitual, the ordinary, the mundane (Felski, 1999/2000) that make up performances of daily life are suggestive of, as Elias (1998)
puts it, a kind of innocence. In essence, this is the pragmatic fulfilling of the essentials or necessities of the quotidian (Felski, 1999/2000). Likewise my interest is not in defining mundane or banal. For me both terms perpetuate the taken-for-grantedness of particular lived experiences. Moreover the words themselves are often perceived negatively – as something not worthy of thought let alone study (Gardiner, 2000). For example, the Oxford English Dictionary defines banal, “/bəˈnɑːl/ older /ˈbeɪnəl/: Commonplace, common, trite; trivial, petty” (Dictionary). Mundane, it defines as; “In weakened sense: ordinary, commonplace. Hence: prosaic, dull, humdrum; lacking interest or excitement” (Dictionary). Rather, my use of these terms is focused on how they might be used to defamiliarise the habitual and routinized, ordinary performances and spaces of everyday life.

The everyday is something that appears as self-evident. As such it is suggested as being “difficult if not ...impossible to articulate what we actually mean by the ‘everyday’” (Jacobsen, 2009, p. 9). However, for Highmore (2002b), it is a case of challenging those who think of the everyday as merely being out-there. By locating the social actor as an active agent, implicated in the everyday, we can then begin to ask whose everyday life it is we are in turn enquiring about.

Somewhat paradoxically, rather than trying to think about what the everyday is, it might be more useful to consider what it is not; what contributes to its lack of distinction and differentiation (Felski, 1999/2000). In thinking in such a way the everyday might be considered as dialectical, synonymous with acts of resistance and subversion (de Certeau, 1984), or conversely, manifest through the constraining affects and the routine qualities of the banal. That being said, everyday life does not exist in a vacuum.

Both time and space are essential to a theorising of the everyday. Whilst the everyday is imbued with rhythms (Lefebvre, 2004) and thus a particular sense of time, it does not communicate a particularised space. In saying that the social production, organisation
and performance of space is a fundamental aspect of the everyday and everyday life (Hemmings et al., 2002). As such the (inter)relationships between space and the everyday are contingent upon, for example, the conception of the spaces of everyday lives as “site[s] separated from movement, in which mind and body can come to rest” (Thrift, 2006, p. 141). However, in this thesis, I aim to think of how a grounding in the mundane might encourage an alternative perspective of spaces in which the world could operate and where the social actor might be considered “less estranged from their bodies and from the messy, chaotic, embodied realities of [every day] life” (Felski, 1999/2000, p. 30). For many it is ‘home’ that grounds performance as mundane and banal. It is from the ordinary performances of home that we, as tourists, allegedly seek escape.

1.3.8 Giving context – ‘Home’

At this point then, I want to locate everyday life in what is often considered a particularised localised space, that of the domestic; the ‘home’. Although the home can be considered an obvious space of everyday life, defining what ‘home’ is becomes somewhat problematic. Certainly, as Watson and Bennet (2002) suggest, (im)mobility has impacted on how we understand the values and meanings invested in the home. Here scale is implicated in the movements and mobilities of people around the world, both voluntary and involuntary. I will give context to my discussion of the spatialisation of everyday life through what Moran (2005) argues is a type of quotidian space, the home as a living space. This allows me, within the thesis, to consider ‘home’ at multiple scales; from the space of the body, to a physically bounded space such as a house or coach to one’s place in the world.

In the context of physical dwelling, such space(s) can be considered as a representation of both daily routines and rhythms. For example, the mundane activities of getting up, washing, leaving, returning and going to bed lend the home a kind of temporality (Randall, 2007) that occurs in a space in which such undertakings and accomplishments of everyday life are also intensely private and personal (Scott, 2009). As such home, in
the context of this thesis, is a space in which one can act out and express a particular self, often hidden from view (Goffman, 1973). It is this idea of home as sanctuary, as a space of domestic ordering (Scott, 2009), home as the habitat of the everyday that is a nexus of everyday life for this thesis. Given that tourism is about being ‘away’ from ‘home’, my interest in everyday life and identity needs to take account of how the mundane habits and domestic routines are (re)configured when one is elsewhere.

As Thrift (2008) contends, the numbers and types of spaces we have to think about and work with has increased as we attend to more-than-human sensibilities. As such a myriad of “actors can now be seen to not just occupy but make up all kinds of intermediary spaces” (Thrift, 2008, p. 18); furnishings, pictures, kitchens and bathrooms – soap, pillows, and toothbrushes all provide a spatialised and material domestic order in which we attempt to make sense of our everyday lives. Thus interactions with such vernacular artefacts are complicit in the construction and performance of everyday space(s) (Abrahams, 2005). Rather than merely human actors engaged in the construction of mundane space(s) and performance(s), more-than-human social actors (see chapter two) also “have a stake in promoting and standardizing what…will become the conventions of the future,” (Shove et al., 2009, p. 38). This includes, for example, those market driven organisations such as tour companies, that characterise tourism as an economic institution and who look to maximise economic benefit through mitigating any challenge to the consumers ontological security. Such rationalising processes, such as the commoditisation and institutionalisation of the living space of everyday life, can however be challenged (and indeed resisted) through a de-localising of ‘home’. It is through such spatial contestation that what have previously been considered static and private performances of daily life can be brought into view.

The tension that exists in everyday life, between “inside and outside” (de Certeau, 2003, p. 11 my italics), or private and public is especially apparent in late modernity. Such tensions can be recognised when we uncritically invite globalised everyday practices
into our homes, such as the mediation, through our satellite-linked televisions. Notable for this thesis, are the lifestyle television shows that not only inform the design of private spaces of home, and when and how we should eat, but moreover have come to dominate our television viewing (West, 2006). Such images (and imaginings) inform and encourage us to (re)configure our everyday home lives within particular ideological (commercial) frameworks. That being said, I am aware of the pitfalls of such a reductionist view of the home as static dwelling and moreover, with the suggestion of its ability to strengthen or weaken domesticity and subsequent domestic everyday practice (Lefebvre, 1991). Rather, I want to acknowledge that the domestic practices of everyday life rather than definitively placed are, to a greater or lesser degree, emplaced (Lloyd, 2003). For me this suggests that “the everyday escapes both the “real” place and leaks into the non-place, confusing stable identities and fixed subject positions” (Lloyd, 2003, pg. 98), thus challenging such reductionist views of home and everyday performance(s) as being fixed in time and space. Such ‘leakage’ allows me to view the intersection of everyday life and home as a (social) space that can be thought of as fluid, mobile and plural (Germann Molz, 2008).

Rather than the everyday as a spatially (or temporally) constrained set of performances, I want to think of the everyday as a way of experiencing the world around me. For sure the construction of knowledge of the everyday might be considered as particularly localised. However the mobilities inherent in the modern world call for new understandings of how we live and perform the socio-spatialities of everyday life. As Shields (1991, pg. 7) contends, our “understandings and concepts of space cannot be divorced from the real fabric of how people live their lives. To do so would be like saying culture is made up of beliefs and traditions but has no impact on how people live”. Moreover, such (non-discursive) practices of daily life modify not only the performance of, but also importantly, how we understand space. After all “lived social space is inextricably linked to represented, imagined space, and that both are essential to
understanding the everyday” (Moran, 2005, pg. 19). That being said, we are, all of us, even tourists, anchored/ensnared in the mundane aspects of everyday life.

Thus in order to explore how the practice of everyday life is performed away from home and can inform the construction of one’s identity, I needed to understand how spaces of the tourist, such as the brochure, the coach and stopping places are constructed.

1.4 Outline of a thesis

My purpose in this chapter has been to provide context for the remainder of the thesis including an element of self-disclosure that provides background for the development of the reflexive methodologies in the following chapter. Additionally I have outlined the more-than-representational approach I have taken both in research and also in the writing up of the thesis. The remainder of this chapter will provide an outline of the direction and structure of the thesis.

As stated, my thesis engages with a reflexive methodology. For me as researcher, it is important to fully disclose and critically engage with the groundings of this research within a pragmatist epistemology. In order to achieve this, in chapter two I will attend to the intellectual heritage of pragmatism. Necessarily then, this will involve a sustained monologue of the pragmatist and symbolic interactionist way(s) of knowing. Following this, I engage critically with the current debates surrounding the domination of representational methodologies within the tourism academy.

In chapter three my attention turns to the methods used in my search for knowledge in the field. This includes how I made use of performances suggested as ubiquitous to both the research performance and the performance of the modern tourist. These include, for example, photography and journals. In this chapter I set out the details of the research including my role as complete member researcher (Adler and Adler, 1987).
Chapter four begins with an analysis of the mobilities of the researcher and touring subject. I analyse what I consider to be a rehearsal of my everyday life (Abrahams, 2005) in the field on-tour. In particular, I explore the representations of the everyday offered within the tour brochure. This chapter has as its focus the extent to which mediations of everyday life work to construct the tourist imaginary – that space which allows corporeal travel to become a reality. A key narrative of this chapter is about the becoming of the tourist-self.

In chapter five I look to my (and others) corporeal travel and turn to the mobilities of particular facets of everyday life on the coach. In particular, I look to understand both what these performances are and how they are (re)configured in space. I discuss the transformation of the tour group from a group of individuals who, through the performances of everyday life, are reconfigured as a temporally and spatially bound community (both as reality and social imaginary). Here I include an exploration of our active participation in the (re)configuration of space, resulting, for example, in the construction of the coach as a localised and interiorising ‘home’. Rather than the discursive construction of the social being-as-tourist I explore how the everyday is invoked in the (performative) construction of identity as both fluid and contingent on banal performances and interactions. I thus look to dramaturgical interventions such as our stillness and movement on board the coach as a way of understanding how interactions mediated performances of particular roles and identities on the tour.

Chapter 6 has as its focus the performance of the mundane and disruptions to touristic motilities. Of particular interest is how performances of the everyday act to create routines and habitualised practices. A key routine within the tour itself was the comfort stop12. By thinking through issues of comfort and (im)mobility I engage with the

12 In this thesis the comfort stop is a term utilised by the organization and reflects points in time where the coach stops for what is suggested to be the ‘comfort’ of the tour participants. I discuss this in detail in chapter six.
affective, embodied possibilities of the banal in critiquing alterity and otherness. Here I suggest the comfort stop and the performance of the banal offers the possibility of embodying the ‘other’ and thus challenges ones identity as consumer.

In chapter seven, I pull together the narratives from the previous three chapters. In doing so my focus turns to the relations between everyday life elsewhere and resultant identity performances of the individual. Given the reflexive nature of this thesis, in chapter seven I also discuss the performance of self both as tourist (in being) and the, at times conflicted, performance of the self-as-researcher.

In the final chapter I reintroduce the objectives of the thesis. In doing so, I highlight the relationship between identity, everyday life and the fully inclusive tour. I finish by suggesting that everyday life is not static, rather it is, like identity, always in-becoming.
Chapter Two: **Methodology**

2.1 **Introduction**

In this chapter I set out the theoretical and conceptual framework of the thesis. As introduced in chapter one, I have engaged with methodologies that are considered reflexive in the search for (and construction of) knowledge. Whilst I discuss interactionism at length, I also engage with other, sometimes eclectic, approaches in my study of performances of the everyday, daily life within the fully inclusive group tour (FIGT).

Given the barriers researchers face when attempting to explore the minutiae of the tourist day (Frohlick and Harrison, 2008), I was drawn to the possibilities of engaging with a reflexive, or as I will discuss more specifically, an analytic auto-ethnographic sensibility (please see 2.4.6). It is unfortunate, however, even given the increasing awareness of the importance of reflexivity in the research endeavour, that reflexive methodologies remain embroiled in what is often antagonistic debate within sections of the academic community (Anthony and Steve, 2010). Numerous assertions against (Delamont, 2007), and for, reflexive methodologies are made regarding theoretical underpinnings and the efficacy of searching for knowledge and realities using these methodologies. As such, and in order to account for these issues this chapter explores the strengths and weaknesses of reflexive methodologies.

My discussion of the philosophical and methodological positions I have taken is somewhat detailed. I have felt the need to make use of what is, after all, somewhat limited space in order to provide the depth needed to give support to the methodological choices I have made. Giving extended space to philosophical discussion and defining how one comes to understand knowledge might be suggested as a semantic diversion.
However, to not spend time (and space) would be to challenge the very reflexivity with which I want to engage. This attention to my philosophical grounding is further prioritised when I think of Thrift’s (2008) close attention to the heritage of pragmatism, as well as current pragmatic thought, arguing the important position of pragmatism in contemporary social science research. Given the complexities of my own philosophical groundings, I wish to establish, for want of a better metaphor, a theoretical road map. This will enable you, the reader, to understand both my worldview and just as importantly, how I sought to understand and construct knowledge in the context of this thesis.

2.2 Attending to reflexivity

I want to attend to the reflexive turn and reflexivity prior to wider philosophical discussions for a number of reasons. Interactionism (see 2.4) is the theoretical construct within which I have situated this thesis. For me, I wanted to make use of (symbolic) interactionism because it enabled me to focus on the interactions of tourists as competent social actors (and agents). In doing so I was able to access insights into how the individual socially constructed and maintained their (touristic) everyday life in the world in which they lived whilst a part of the FIGT. Certainly one can explore everyday life through symbolic interactions. However, it was the “reflexive, creative and communicative doings of people in which meaning is fashioned” (Waskul, 2009, p. 117. My italics), that allowed me to understand the minutiae of daily life on tour.

In thinking of the (reflexive) self within interactionism, Prus (1996) argued the social self exists only in relation to the recognition of oneself as (social) object. However, in order to recognise oneself as object there must be a prior recognition of the other. Here, Mead (1934) argues “it is this characteristic of the self as an object unto itself that [s/he] want[s] to bring out. This characteristic is represented in the word “self” which is reflexive and indicates that which can be both subject and object” (in Prus, 1996, p. 55).
I consider that one socially constructs meaning about the world in which they inhabit and live. As such, reflexivity is operationalised when one’s social behaviours are in turn influenced (consciously or subconsciously) by this world, which in turn re-makes that world (Reynolds and Herman-Kinney, 2003). This process of reflexivity is further considered a process of mind in the sense that one is suggested as having active agency (Waskul, 2009). Moreover, one engages in meaningful acts in order to transform external stimuli into social objects. The subsequent symbolic interactions are thereafter combined creatively (and mindfully) into “a definition of the situation that mobilises and directs” the individuals actions (MacKinnon, 1994, p. 15).

It was thinking through the construction and engagement of the reflexive self that encouraged me to think of how I might deal with Saukko’s (2002) assertion that “we can only comprehend another person’s experience by comparing it to our own” (pg. 253). Certainly a reflexive turn can be seen by the development of a new self-conscious and critical ethnographic endeavour. This can be recognised in increasing engagement(s) with reflexive ethnographies, when for example, undertaking anthropology at ‘home’, as well as the operationalization of reflexive ethnography, such as analytic autoethnography (Collins and Gallinat, 2010). (Please see Chapter Seven for a detailed discussion of the reflexive individual and everyday life.)

2.3 Coming to a ‘philosophy’

Progressing through the initial stages of this thesis, I came to realise that I understood the world in which I live from the position of a pragmatist philosophy. Given my own background in hotel management I became particularly enthused by one of the founding fathers of classical American pragmatism, Robert Park’s (in McKinney (1966, pg. 71) exhortation to his students that they “[g]o and sit in the lounges of luxury hotels...in short gentlemen, go get the seat of your pants dirty in real research”. Park’s objective was to make problematic the domination of theorising in sociology (at that time) through
building an awareness of the need to attend to both “theoretical presuppositions and empirical observations” (Fine, 1995, p. 58). In short I felt as if I was being encouraged to go and reflect on a previous life.

A particular issue when discussing pragmatism is producing a description or definition that is acceptable to all observers (Bernstein, 2010). Thus, rather than offering one specific definition, I view pragmatism as a shared approach to philosophical problems (Edgar and Sedgwick, 1999). As such, I will discuss pragmatism as it relates directly to issues within analytic auto-ethnography (as methodology rather than method) and the tensions between realist ethnography and emotive and evocative auto-ethnography. In the process of situating pragmatism as my epistemological position, I consider it pertinent to briefly discuss its historical roots.

2.3.1 Pragmatism explored

What is often labelled ‘American’ pragmatism can trace its roots back via Kant to the time of Plato (Rockmore, 2006). However, the modern philosophical tradition of American pragmatism has its genesis in the late 19th century, primarily in the works of Charles Pierce, John Dewey and William James (Misak, 2013, Feffer, 1993). To these, and others such as George Herbert Mead, reality was considered dynamic. Furthermore, individuals themselves were considered as actively engaged in the construction of knowledge. As such, meaning can be considered “linked to social action and perspectives, and knowledge [becomes] an instrumental force that enables people to solve problems and rearrange [their] world” (Sandstrom et al., 2003, p. 217). Thus, rather than responding mechanically (instinctively and impulsively) to the world, one is able to reflect on the world around oneself and the issues and opportunities that present themselves and in turn make decisions on how to act or not act (Burkitt, 2008).

Pragmatism then, refers to a “view of knowledge that stresses its practical achievements” (Atkinson and Housley, 2003, pg. 121). For example, everyday life is a social endeavour
and as such, the self that is constructed through everyday performances must be considered as a consequence of social processes. Therefore, society itself can be regarded as a discursive form of interaction (Vannini, 2008). Whether one is thinking about reality in the natural world or the social world, knowledge is based on the same principles of exploration and interpretation. Thus, following Atkinson and Housley (2003), rather than understanding science (and hence knowledge) as somehow out-there, my understanding of knowledge comes through my engagement in, with and through the world in which I exist. Therefore to me pragmatist knowledge is a practical accomplishment found through human and non-human action (Atkinson and Housley, 2003).

Pragmatism seeks to understand how “life is done by those living it” (Lock and Strong, 2010, p. 121), with the pragmatist exploring the world through interactions and everyday acts and performances. Burkitt (2008), for example, argues for ideas as social “being produced through interaction within groups of interacting individuals” (p. 32). Such practical knowledge however, needs to be considered as incomplete, partial and provisional as understanding and meaning making is always an on-going project (Atkinson and Housley, 2003).

Of course the world has changed since American pragmatism emerged in the latter part of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th century (Shook and Ryan, 2000, Becker, 1999, Deegan, 2007). Consequently there has been a recent problematising of knowledge as being primarily a discursive construct. The power of discourse is challenged, for example, by the questioning of authority of text and representation (Abelson, 1979). This has resulted in emergent methodologies that attend to the non-representational (Thrift, 2008), or as Lorimer (2005) contends, of social life needing to be understood as being more-than-representational. Given these challenges to past traditions of knowledge construction there has been criticism of the overly optimistic and complacent view of the pragmatist philosophy in the context of late modernity (Vannini, 2008).
Certainly during the mid-20th century there was the suggestion that pragmatism had become rather out-dated (Rorty, 1982). However, Rorty (2009), went on to argue these criticisms were somewhat naive as well as being overly dismissive of the possibilities offered by pragmatism. Subsequently there has been renewed interest in pragmatism in the latter part of the 20th century. This was, at least in part, a result of the dismissal of critics as being primarily “anti-pragmatist” (Rorty, 1980, pg. 732). This argument was furthered by Rorty’s exhortation as to the possibilities of pragmatism during his presidential address to the American Sociological Association (Rorty, 1980). Moreover pragmatism has moved past the idea of its practical applications in research to the foregrounding of the “broader value of pragmatism as a philosophical system” (Morgan, 2014, pg. 1).

Within current thinking in pragmatism there is increasing emphasis placed on attending to the body in how we understand social (inter)actions. As Edgar and Sedgwick (2007) argue, pragmatism reinforces the importance of “the embodied, practical experience of the world” (p. 30). As a result, pragmatism offers a way to think about the affective and embodied possibilities of everyday life. These possibilities of and for the body, however, need to be understood in context. There is for example a suggestion that many of one’s (embodied) actions are habitual and carried out in an unreflexive manner (Jacobsen, 2009). As such it is “only when habit breaks down or is not appropriate to the task” that we can then “become conscious of our actions and self” (Burkitt, 2008, pg. 33). There are, of course, concerns when thinking of the mind/body dualism; where bodily doing and mindful problem solving are considered an integral part of human action (Shilling, 2003). However I would suggest that these can be surmounted by the principles of reflexivity, and moreover, remain congruent with the wider ethics of a pragmatist epistemology.

As a (research) praxis, pragmatism is informed by and “reflects the plurality of multiple positions, practices and insights” (Ren et al., 2010, p. 886). To me, pragmatism offers the opportunity to explore the performances of the multiple agents that are part and parcel
of everyday life on tour. Certainly one might suggest the performance of the tourist daily life is a fertile hunting ground, where the everyday life of the social actor is suddenly open to the disruptions associated with being away from 'home'.

In order to illustrate the links between my philosophy as introduced above, and the methodology and methods that I have employed for this thesis, I have graphically illustrated below how pragmatism feeds through to my wider methodology in Table 2.1. I now want to turn to the theoretical perspective that informed the empirical research for this thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Theoretical perspective</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>Interactionism(s)/</td>
<td>Reflexive ethnographies (Analytic auto-ethnography)</td>
<td>Sensory ethnographic methods Visual ethnographic methods Participant observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 The knowledge framework employed in this thesis after Crotty (1998)
2.4 Interactionism

Interactionism has its foundations within the pragmatic tradition (Atkinson and Housley, 2003). As such, I consider the social actor, when interacting, as being “pragmatic in that they respond to and adjust their behaviour in line with their interpretations of the actions of others” with whom they interact (Collinson, 2008, pg. 39). Interactionism can be considered a useful and appropriate way to think about social actors’ performances and lived experiences (Blumer, 1969, Charon, 2007, Prus, 1996, Reynolds and Herman-Kinney, 2003), and thus for me, is the most appropriate theory to explore the everyday doings and considerations of the social actor that are at the heart of this thesis (Denzin, 2009, Jacobsen, 2009).

A particular strength of interactionism is in the empirical approach it allows one to engage in during meaning making (Becker and McCall, 1990). The empirical turn in sociology can be traced to the foundations of symbolic interaction (Charon, 2007), and can be suggested as having its foundations in responding to the historical privileging of theory over practice (Prus, 1996). Interaction has as its focus the observation, recording and analysis of those social acts theorised within pragmatism. In the context of this thesis, it is an understanding of the interactions with and between social objects where meaning is located (McCall and Becker, 1990) and which encouraged me to think of how observing and participating in the performance of the (touristic) everyday may offer a particularly potent way of knowing.

My engagement with interactionism was (and continues to be) a further opportunity to deconstruct the appearance of social order (Scott, 2006b). It is such order that is suggested as central to the rationalisation of daily interactions and performances (Ritzer, 2000), that occur as a consequence of processes of modernisation (Bauman, 1989). As Atkinson and Housley (2003, pg. 12) suggest, the “social self and social order [are] themselves process and product of collaborative work”. It is through this ordering, as
well as collaborative interaction, that the tourist negotiates daily life. The possibility of disruption and ruptures to these spaces and performances provides me with insights into the make-up of the social order of everyday life away from home.

I now want to discuss the human actor as social object (Vaitkus, 1991). In talking of social objects I refer to those objects, human and more-than-human, with which we interact as social beings (Allan, 2007). We are all social objects; to be an interactionist is to understand entities as social objects which come into being through our interactions and encounters, where we “call attention to it, name it, and attach legitimate lines of behaviour to it” (Allan, 2006, pg. 35). It is important to understand social objects come into being only through such interaction(s). Likewise social objects have different meanings to different people, and are additionally context specific. As Blumer (1969, pg. 12) argues; “[social] objects have no fixed status except as their meaning is sustained through indications and definitions that people make of the objects”. Thus a suitcase, as a social object, can for some come to represent travelling away from home, whilst to others it becomes a representation of home (see chapter seven). Therefore, I think of ’stuff’ such as the suitcase, the coach, journals and the tour brochure as active agents and, as well as humans, equally social objects.

2.4.1 Situating Interactionism as a way of knowing tourism and hospitality
Interactionism has a varied trajectory within the study of social phenomenon such as modern tourism and the tourist. It is important to note here that interactionism, and more specifically symbolic interaction as a methodology, was an early contributor to the search for knowledge of and about tourism. Whilst arguably not about tourism as we might understand it today, early interactionist ethnographies sought knowledge of spaces commonly utilised by modern tourists to maintain daily life. Amongst notable examples, and particularly relevant given the focus of this thesis are Hayner’s (1923) PhD investigating social life within hotels as spaces which provide support for the tourist, alongside his later monograph of hotel life (Hayner, 1936) and notable
sociologist William Foote-Whyte, author of the seminal text, *Street Corner Society* who looked at the interactions between restaurant workers and restaurant customers (Whyte, 1946), and subsequently the social structure and performance of class within American restaurants (Whyte, 1949). These and other studies constructed knowledge about activities and space that facilitate the ability of the self to exist away from home, such as when performing the tourist. Later publications using interactionism include the study of tour groups with the aim of understanding how social groups are constructed and maintained (Gorman, 1979) and the performance of tourism, or more precisely the act of being a tourist, such as the early interactionist work by Dean MacCannell (1973, 1976). Invoking aspects of dramaturgy, one of MacCannell's most notable contributions to understanding the tourist was the adaptation of Erving Goffman's front-region and back-region (Goffman, 1973), to think about and theorise (in)authentic tourist encounters. In a similar vein, Colten (1987) argues the utility of engaging interactionism in understanding leisure, tourism and recreation as a social action and a particular performance of self.

Given that performance (and indeed dramaturgy more broadly) are central concepts within this thesis it is important to note that Goffman, in *Frame Analysis* (1986), reappraised the theatrical metaphor, from which his idea of the stage arose. Rather than the “theatricality of ordinary behaviour” in the context of ‘staged’ theatre, performance is instead the “necessary consequence of the individual’s capacity for portioning the self into a multiplicity of part-selves” (Burns, 1992). Thus to Goffman, performance is a way we (inter)act socially in order to give some sense to, and have the ability to perform identity in-the-world.

The call to interactionism in studying tourists and tourism came at approximately the same time as a call for a more sophisticated methodological approach to the study of tourism (Dann et al., 1988, pg. 1). However, I find it somewhat perplexing that such authors seem to specifically distance ethnography from interactionism, suggesting
ethnography as an anthropological endeavour (as method), rather than an understanding of ethnography as a particular methodological tool through which an interactionist sensibility might emerge.

In discussing the sociological study of tourism, Dann and Cohen (1996) document the extent to which interactionism had caught “the imagination of tourism researchers” (p. 311), more so than any other sociological theory. Whilst discussing the possibilities of interaction in coming to know tourism, Dann and Cohen (1996) go on to argue that dramaturgy had not been utilised to the extent it might have been. It is somewhat ironic then that interactionism fell out of favour with all but a few in the tourism academy until late in the 20th century (Ulmer, 2003). It is, in the main, only through the interventions of those from outside the tourism academy who have highlighted the possibilities of interactionism, which has resulted in its recent resurgence.

2.5 From realist ethnographies to reflexive ethnographies

In this thesis I have adopted a reflexive methodology and more particularly that of analytic auto-ethnography. In order to properly discuss analytic auto-ethnography I want to briefly discuss ethnography more generally and importantly the issues that arise when understanding ethnography from within different disciplines.

During the research and writing of this thesis I have been situated within a tourism department and more widely located within a business school. This is important as context influences what is regarded as acceptable ways of knowledge construction. When one attempts to make use of what are seen as different methodologies then one’s place in the academic space can be challenged. However, for me at least, an issue that has
arisen as a result of undertaking the thesis outside of a disciplinary framework\textsuperscript{13} is the challenge to how I define concepts, especially given the extent to which definitions differ across (and are increasingly contested within) disciplines (Lugosi, 2009). Therefore, prior to my discussing analytic auto-ethnography I want to be specific in how I conceive and understand the concept of ethnography. In doing so I certainly do not wish to deny the multiple orthodoxies of ethnography (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007), rather I want to make clear how I made use of ethnography - as both doing and writing (Davies, 2008).

As I have illustrated in Table 2.1, interactionism informed my understanding of ethnography (as methodology rather than method). Although, as Hammersley contends “interactionist ethnography emerged out of pragmatism” in the context of this thesis it is the relations between interactionism and ethnography that are of interest, after all interactionism is steeped in ethnographic enquiry (Prus, 1996). As Anderson (2006) argues, what is of importance here is that ethnography offers a methodology that allows us to deal with the realities of social encounters (Hammersley, 1992). From the interactionist's perspective this is crucial as ethnographic approaches are considered “consistent with traditional symbolic interactionist epistemological assumptions and goals” (Anderson, 2006, pg. 378). Moreover, ethnography itself has been influenced by, amongst other theoretical positions, that of symbolic interactionism (Hammersley, 1992).

The development of autoethnography more specifically has been furthered by a number of symbolic interactionists including amongst others, Norman Denzin (please see 2.5.2

---

\textsuperscript{13} There has been a sustained debate as to the veracity of the claim of disciplinary status by many in/outside the study of tourism (see e.g. Coles et al, 2005; Mason, 2000; Kelly et al, 1992; Tribe, 2009) Without wanting to, at this point, get into this debate I view tourism as a field of enquiry that gives context to not only post disciplinary enquiry (Coles et al. 2009), but importantly for me the possibility to engage in trans-disciplinary thinking. That being said, when undertaking a thesis within a business school there are numerous epistemological and methodological barriers that need to be overcome (Doloriert et al. 2011)
and 2.5.4 for further discussion). Moreover analytic autoethnography is consistent with qualitative inquiry rooted in traditional symbolic interactionism (Anderson, 2006). As such, in the context of this thesis my understanding of encounters (and my interpretation of the interactions), was facilitated through the interpretive opportunities afforded by ethnographic methods, such as participant observation, as well as ethnography as methodology.

Defining ethnography becomes somewhat problematic when one reads through its diverse histories (Wolcott, 2008). My intention here is not to delve deeply into these histories as these are adequately covered elsewhere (Wolcott, 2010). What I do wish to comment on are overarching differences recognised in ethnography from within two disciplines in particular – those of anthropology and sociology.

Possibly the most dominant feature of ethnography in anthropology is the extent to which the “confrontation of the ethnographer with an ‘alien’ culture is the methodological and epistemological foundation of the anthropological enterprise” (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007, pg. 81). Thus historically, doing ethnography entailed extended periods of time, “often over the course of a year or more” (2007, pg. 1), in the field observing others. The focus of such ethnography was on determining the underlying rules of the (different) culture under observation (Haviland and Haviland, 2005). Whilst certainly having its roots in (colonial) anthropology (Pels and Salemink, 1999), such ethnographic practice has been subject to the influence of a number of theoretical challenges which have included, amongst others, philosophical pragmatism and interactionism (Denzin, 2003a, Prus, 1996).

Primary protagonists were the so-called Chicago School of Sociology, additionally labelled the Chicago School of Ethnography (Deegan, 2007). Amongst the earlier interactionist ethnographers one can include Erving Goffman, William Foote Whyte and Howard S. Becker. The primary difference between the sociological ethnographies of
these individuals (and schools) and those of anthropologists was the refocusing of the research from the culture of the ‘other’ to the everyday social encounters of the researcher’s own culture. This included, for example, constructing knowledge of the micro-social aspects of the society (and societies) to which one belongs (Blumer, 1969). In saying that, it is important to note that researching one’s own culture does not presuppose the researcher as insider. Although one comes from the culture or society under investigation it does not imply one knows. Certainly, any research grounded in interactionism needs to attend to the tentative, the empirical and in turn, be responsive and open to new meaning. After all, as Rock (2007, pg. 29) argues, “the social world is taken to be a place where little can be taken for granted ab initio, a place not of statics but of process, where acts, objects and people have evolving and intertwined local identities that may not be revealed at the outset”. Thus whilst one may be observing one’s own society, (prior) knowledge cannot, and moreover, should not be taken for granted.

Common to both sociological and anthropological ethnographies is the participation of the researcher in interactions and encounters within the field. However, a fundamental difference between these two disciplines is the researcher’s participation in (subject) groups and the extent to which the researcher is, or remains, an outsider/insider, both in the field and in the writing (up) of the ethnography. The ethnographer might indeed be interacting within the group under study as a way of “learning and gaining trust, being able eventually to replicate some of the subjective knowledge of the world under view” (Rock, 2007, pg. 32). However, in gaining some sense of insider status, it can always be argued that the knowledge gained is always in question due to the positioning of the researcher as ‘outsider’.

An individual’s position(ing) of ones self-as-researcher can be suggested as a form of ethnographic marginality whereby the researcher remains to a greater or lesser extent, a stranger (Emerson et al., 1995, p.). In so doing the researcher is supposedly set outside
the study of the marginalised in society. As a result those doing the research are themselves situated as marginalised actors (Atkinson, 1990). However these positions suggest an exteriorisation of the researcher. This is (erroneously) to suggest the impossibility of the individual ever being researcher and, simultaneously subject of inquiry.

A substantive difference between anthropological and other (especially sociological) ethnographies relates to the time one must spend in the field. Certainly within anthropology as a discipline there is an assumption that an extended period of time must be spent in the field conducting research (Bryman, 2004b). This period is regarded by many as a disciplinary *rite de passage* for professional anthropologists (Malinowski et al., 1993). Whilst time in the field certainly appears to be a ‘rite of passage’ for anthropologists, many other social science endeavours are increasingly challenging such disciplinary codifications (Rist, 1980).

There has been sustained interest in ethnographies carried out in societies known to the researcher. Certainly I do not question the need for extended periods spent assimilating into new cultures; however one can challenge the requirement for extended periods to be spent gaining the background knowledge in order to study one’s own culture (Davies, 2008, Voloder, 2008). As I have discussed in the previous chapter I have spent a substantial period of my life interacting with tourists. Moreover in the case of this thesis fieldwork was to be carried out in a FIGT where passengers’ were in the main fellow Australasians and whom the tour brochure suggested as being culturally similar to myself (please see chapter five for further discussion on participants).

### 2.5.1 Representation

An objective of traditional (realist) ethnography has been to produce a detailed description of a particular culture primarily based on extended periods of fieldwork (Haviland and Haviland, 2005). However the unproblematic representation of these
others cultures lived experiences has resulted in the so-called ‘crisis of representation’ (Van Maanen, 1995). Marcus’s (1998) criticisms of ethnography are that representation legitimated “new objects, new styles of research and writing” suggesting a need for a refocusing of research towards “the underdeveloped project of cultural critique” (p. 183). Out of the critique of realist ethnography has come a challenge to the legitimacy of the qualitative researcher’s claim(s) of being able to directly capture others lived experience(s) (Lincoln and Denzin, 2003). Nevertheless, until recently, the unproblematic representation(s) of the toured and touring ‘other’ dominated the tourism research narrative and moreover to this day maintains particular myths of tourism, for example tourism as escape.

The use of realist methodologies in the study of tourism are suggested by Crick (1989, pg. 307) as generating “ambivalent or contradictory representations”. Certainly this is evident in the study of mundane (non-exotic) performances by the individual-as-tourist. More often than not these are representations of meaning(s) configured through their correspondence to economic ideologies. Thus our knowledge of tourists performance of everyday activities such eating and sleeping is often represented through a dominant discourse that unproblematically situates the individual-as-consumer. Thus the tourist and their everyday life are understood as performed through consumptive practices – the individual represented in and through (commercial) spaces such as the restaurant and hotel.

Following on from the cultural turn in disciplines such as geography (Hollinshead and Ivanova, 2013, Valentine, 2001) there has been a renewed interest in the implications of the crisis of representation within tourism studies. As such, rather than the representation of tourism being limited to the supposedly exotic, those banal overlooked practices of daily life have also increasingly become open to analysis. Rather than these performances being considered as mere consumption, they are now increasingly considered an exciting part of the active world of the individual (Cadman, 2009).
Moving on, an issue with an empirical interactionist research agenda is attending to the politics involved in the actual interactions between the participants and the researcher and the subsequent (re)presentation of these interactions in a form that might be understood as meaningful by others (Myers, 2010). Of particular concern is the notion that there is an objective truth that acts to separate the researcher from those under study. Here I want to heed Said’s (1989) suggestion that there is no space outside of the interaction along with the impossibility that one can ever have knowledge that is never not subjectively constructed. Thus, it follows that the reflexive self of the interactionist researcher becomes both more centrally situated and meaningful. In order for this to proceed, the ability for the researcher to represent, “requires that one become self-reflexive, conscious of one’s own viewpoint when trying to understand [and represent] viewpoints in general” (Myers, 2010, p. 376).

The researcher then needs to think through how s/he is actively engaged in giving voice to, or muting certain things, actions and voices. Likewise, in giving importance and visibility to certain processes and not others, the researcher needs to be sure to reflect and give voice to how and to what extent s/he is implicated not merely in the “transformation of the world which they thought for too long they were only representing” (Soderstrom, 2005, p. 15), but also the active construction of that world.

Whilst I have suggested there are issues with representation, I want to acknowledge the on-going importance of representation in the construction of knowledge (Rorty, 2009). Moreover I want to emphasise that in the critiquing of representation there is an opportunity to (re)situate representation. As Myers (2010, p. 376) suggests, the research encounter can become a “collaborative conversation”, between active and reflexive social agents in the tradition of pragmatism. Likewise this encourages and opens up possibilities for ethnographic praxis as both a dialogic and intersubjective endeavour.
My rationale for discussing representation is to do with the opportunities afforded by reflexive ethnography. Issues surrounding the ‘power’ of representation have resulted in researchers looking for new understandings of ethnography and in turn how we might legitimately (re)present the ‘other’ (and of course ourselves). Analytic auto-ethnography, amongst other reflexive ethnographic positions, is suggested as offering an epistemological “orientation to the relationships among experience, knowledge and representation that has a variety of methodological implications” (Butz, 2010, pg. 139). Reflexive ethnography then allowed me to attend to the situatedness of the “narrating and experiencing self” as researcher and simultaneously (but separately) subject of research. My focus became about undertaking this thesis in such a way as to “produce a social text that reflexively collapse[d] the distinction between representing and performing experience”, (Butz, 2010, pg. 141) and thus worked towards making the personal cultural (Ellis and Bochner, 2003). Furthermore, in adopting a reflexive methodology, it allowed me to deconstruct the intersecting personal and cultural practices as they worked to shape my (and others) realities and everyday life(styles). These realities (but also imaginaries) included, for example class, gender, race and sexuality. In essence it enabled me to begin to deal with those issues that must be acknowledged within reflexive qualitative research praxis.

2.5.2 Coming to reflexive methodologies

In the above I have discussed my position on reflexivity. More specifically, I have approached both the research and production of this thesis from the perspective of analytic auto-ethnography. Now that I have established epistemological and theoretical frameworks, I wish to discuss the methodologies employed in understanding what data is; where I could possibly find it; how I might analyse it and last but possibly more importantly, how I might write data. Initially I want to discuss the debate(s) surrounding auto-ethnography more generally, as a reflexive methodology. Importantly I acknowledge criticisms of auto-ethnography as a valid methodology and look to analytic
auto-ethnography as offering the possibility of a sophisticated reflexivity (Anderson, 2006).

The study of tourists, when understood as a widely distributed and particularly mobile culture is fraught with difficulty (Harrison, 2008). Thus one might ask, how does one ‘do’ ethnographic research with a group that lacks any “habitus of collectivity” (Amit, 2000, pg. 14). Privileging of the tourist-as-individual presents challenges to the research endeavour. Furthermore, this is exacerbated by the difficulties in accessing the intimacies of tourist’s daily life combined with the potential to disrupt the performance of both tourism and researcher identity (Harrison, 2003, Frohlick and Harrison, 2008 and please see chapter 3),

From a pragmatic (and personal) perspective, during the initial stages of the thesis I was finding it difficult to disentangle, distance and disengage from my often contested identities. This included those memories of lived (past) experiences, including my memories of interacting with tourists as a hotel manager. However, I was also aware of Botterill’s (2000, 2007) call for the specific emplacement of the researchers’ previous lived experience within their research. Whilst acknowledging the idea of reflexivity, I was finding it difficult to become or be in any way objective about my research and PhD objectives. I often found myself immersed in literatures that challenged the need for impartial observation. Much of this literature suggested that no interpretation or knowledge could be entirely value free. In addition, I became increasingly encouraged by the literature that embraced, and legitimised, the immersion of the researcher and her/his histories in the research project.

The boundary between ethnography and auto-ethnography is becoming increasingly blurred (Ngunjiri et al., 2010). Given the attention ethnographers now pay to issues of identity, power and representation, it is increasingly difficult for the researcher’s (reflexive) subjectivity to not become more evident. Certainly, we (as ethnographers) are
aware we are not merely writing about others but rather we are looking to how we might (legitimately) write with them, and in many cases where critical reflexive ethnography is invoked, how we might write on their behalf as subjects ourselves (Conquergood, 2006). In thinking (and acting) this way one can begin to know the possibilities that might emerge when linking (ones) self to the writing of culture (Butz, 2010).

By and large auto-ethnography is considered a product of the narrative self (Ellis et al., 2011). As such the researcher’s self becomes a key source of data. Auto-ethnographies can be viewed as a particular methodological response to the crisis of representation discussed earlier (Denzin, 2003b). Furthermore, as a methodology, auto-ethnography can be regarded as a means of adopting a particularly subjectivist stance to the production of knowledge (Crotty, 1998) where the subject and focus of the research is the researcher’s self (Ellis and Bochner, 2003). Often consisting of highly personalised accounts of life changing experiences, for example Ellis’s (1995) account of her partner’s illness and death, auto-ethnographies are frequently, written in an emotive and evocative way that encourages the reader to become part of the actual experience (Atkinson, 2006). In doing so these reports are frequently regarded (erroneously) as a postmodern methodology (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011).

More often than not in an auto-ethnography, the reader carries out the interpretation of the (personal) narrative(s). This is suggested as a deliberate writing strategy, engaging the reader as an active agent in the dialogic production and consumption of the multiple realities available within the text (Wall, 2008). Auto-ethnography is then primarily focussed on “research, writing, story, and method that connect the autobiographical and personal to the cultural, social and political” (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2006, pg. 189).

It must be noted here that certain linguistic tensions become apparent in ‘naming’ ethnography as auto, and that whilst I talk of auto-ethnography there are numerous
other (reflexive) ethnographies that employ the development of the self within (one’s own) culture. Ellis and Bochner (2000, in Chang, 2008) for example, list 39 different labels for methodologies engaging with an auto-ethnographic orientation. Among the most notable, from the point of view of this thesis, are complete-member-researcher, native ethnography and reflexive ethnography.

2.5.3 Issues of auto-ethnography

Given the debate surround auto-ethnography, I now want to deal with the critical, but sometimes destructive (Delamont, 2007), criticisms of auto-ethnography. The two issues I want to address are the claim made against auto-ethnography of being self-indulgent, and the somewhat aligned suggestion that auto-ethnography is narcissistic (Sparkes, 2002).

Certainly to my mind, some auto-ethnographies might be suggested as lacking the critical detachment that allows the irony needed for the operationalisation of reflexivity (Meneley and Young, 2005). A common feature in many auto-ethnographies is the use of first person, leading to the potential for the authors’ voice and experience to dominate the text (de Freitas and Paton, 2009). In doing so s/he has, as their ultimate objective, being situated as unambiguously subjective (Russell, 1999). It is such preoccupation with intellectual subjectivity (and issues of object and subject) that privileges the author’s voice above any others. Nevertheless, such authorial saturation (Geertz, 1988) and subsequent solipsism should be considered a symptom rather than an underlying problem of auto-ethnography and thus should not detract from its usefulness (Rosaldo, 1993).

To Anderson (2006), such self-absorption results in auto-ethnography losing its sociological promise. Certainly when writing (and thinking) within interactionism I consider an underlying problem of auto-ethnography to be the hegemonic position of the
subjective (self) over the intersubjective (self). To me, this results in the neglect or even exclusion of the social self, knowing in and through interaction.

As Blumer (1969) suggests, meaning “is derived from, or arises out of the social interaction that one has with ones fellows” (p. 2). If, as many auto-ethnographies seem to suggest, we neglect the self as being involved in, and part of, what Prus (1969 in Jacobsen, 2009, p. 121) considers an “intersubjective, multi-perspectival, reflexive, activity-based, relational and processual” and inherently social human group, then we run the risk of reverting to Descartes’ dictum, ‘I think therefore I am’. It is important therefore to acknowledge the existence of a socialised self, and thus the (possibility at least of a) ‘minded’, or reflexive self (Waskul, 2009). After all, as Waskul (2009) argues; “the ability to state ‘I am’ is a quintessential reflexive act”.

Many who argue against auto-ethnography might themselves become open to similar criticism, where “those who protect the self from scrutiny could as well be labelled self-satisfied and arrogant in presuming their presence and relations with others to be unproblematic” (Okely and Callaway, 1992, pg. 2). As England (1994) contends; one cannot hide the personal self behind the researcher self because the performance of field work itself is inherently personal (Coffey, 1999). That being said, I would suggest the reflexivity of much auto-ethnography is often incorrectly confused with the self-adoration associated with narcissism, navel gazing and self-indulgence.

The idea of reflexive methodologies, as Okely (1992) has suggested, is to “work through the specificity of the [researchers] self in order to contextualise it and transcend it”. Acknowledging this fieldwork (or meetings, as I introduce in Chapter Three) and the lived experiences of the researcher requires a deconstruction of self and relationships developed with the same rigour demanded of ethnographies in sociology or anthropology.
After the difficulties in disentangling my identities (outlined in section 2.4.4), I was able to negotiate multiple realities of (my)self within the research itself when I became aware of the possibilities afforded by attending to the more-than-representational (Carolan, 2008). Rather than privileging a completely centred, subjective self (of auto-ethnography), I was able to engage (my)self as embodied, affective and performative. Challenging the domination of representation enabled me to (re)think auto-ethnography as a space of ‘multiple permutations of ...’voices’ – speaker, seer, seen” (Russell, 1999, pg. 277), which in turn added a particular richness and diversity to the research endeavour.

At this point I wish to divert from engaging with the post-modern aspects of (much) contemporary auto-ethnography. To my mind, the focus of auto-ethnography on the emotive and evocative is somewhat exclusionary. Of course it attends to post-modern sensibilities such as the end of meta-narratives and additionally in promulgating ideas of the (im)possibility of an idealist reality. That being said, I certainly did not want to do away with the vulnerability of the researcher that becomes achievable within self-narrative; rather I wanted to challenge and decentre the authorial voice (Rath, 2001). As such, and following Anderson (2006), I believe there is place for realism within the production of reflexive ethnographies that rather than restricting, maintains and encourages engagement with self-knowledge.

2.5.4 Possibilities of analytic auto-ethnography

Given there is a focus, within auto-ethnography, on the emotive and evocative and alongside issues I have discussed above, I was somewhat reluctant to engage with this methodology. I was, however, encouraged when reading Reed-Danahay's (1997) view that self-narrative might also include the self in the social context. This did, however, lead me to think about the potential tension in attempting to gain both an emic and etic perspective (Helfrich, 1999). Possibly the most powerful impetus for me to (re)engage with an alternative auto-ethnographic sensibility (Butz, 2010) or reflexive methodology, came from reading Leon Anderson’s (2006) paper on analytic autoethnography. Whilst
self-identifying himself (as researcher) as a full group member he remained “troubled by the epistemological paradigm within which current auto-ethnography discourse is embedded” (Anderson, 2006, pg. 374). Furthermore he, as did I, wanted an alternative auto-ethnography that remained consistent with qualitative enquiry rooted in interactionism and situated within a pragmatic epistemology. Analytic auto-ethnography thus provided me with a methodology capable of being operationalised in a way that combined the strengths of both traditional ethnographic and auto-ethnographic approaches (O’Byrne, 2007).

According to Anderson (2006, p. 378), analytic auto-ethnography has five key tenets. Namely that the:

- The researcher take on complete membership of the group or community, [in this case my participation as tourist/researcher on a group tour];
- There be an analytic reflexivity (sophisticated);
- A visibility of the researcher’s self remains visible within the narrative but does not dominate;
- There is dialogue with others beyond the self (becomes dialogic rather than monologic, intersubjective rather than purely subjective)
- And there is an on-going commitment to, and practice of, theoretical analysis of the data. (Anderson, 2006, p. 378)

Anderson (2006, pg. 379) further suggests, “deeply personal and self-observant ethnography can rise above ideographic particularity to address broader theoretical issues”. As you (the reader) read through this thesis I aim to be transparent about how I have attended to these five central tenets of analytic auto-ethnography. However, given issues of access to the tourist I now want to briefly focus on two of these tenets, specifically, issues of researcher positionality and dialogue with informants beyond the self.
2.5.4.1 Researcher positionality

To become a complete member researcher one generally enters the field (in my case the FIGT) in two ways, either as convert or opportunistic member (Adler and Adler, 1987). Uniquely, the formation of the tour group under study allowed me to initially participate through my being yet another stranger amongst strangers. The individuals, who made up the group, including myself, came together opportunistically. None of us, excluding couples, knew of or had interacted with the others prior to this group. Thus, it can be suggested, I became part of an emergent group through chance circumstance (Anderson, 2006).

As a ‘convert’ member there is the suggestion that my interest in the setting predated involvement in the actual group. Thus as researcher, I become converted to complete membership during the course of the research (see especially chapter five for a discussion on community). Furthermore, in acknowledging the voice of the academic analyst alongside my role as subjectively engaged tour group member, I was able to employ the critical perspective “gained by occupying a self-representational location at the unstable margins of dominant discourse and between disparate social worlds” (Butz, 2010, p. 140). Here I refer to the tensions between my researcher self (as work) and my membership of a community of tourists (see chapter five). In the context of this thesis to attempt to prioritise one identity performance was to disable the other.

Given that this group did not exist prior to the research, entry was somewhat problematic. That being said, the idea of the group (as an imaginary) certainly existed. As I discuss in more detail in chapter four, I was able to ‘practice’ membership and came to know of the expected values and behaviours by my engagement with, for example, the organisations brochures and social networking sites. I would point out here that whilst I talk of a group, this does not mean all cultural values and beliefs of the group were shared, rather there were common cultural and social characteristics within the group, including our shared identity as tourists.
Analytic auto-ethnography can be seen as operationalised with the researcher, at times, attempting to claim an objective position (Butler, 2009) and as such position themselves as outside the narrative. Analytic auto-ethnography then became a way for me to address issues many researchers face when trying to obtain access and subsequent knowledge of and about tourists (Harrison, 2003, Frohlick and Harrison, 2008). By using analytic auto-ethnography I was able to (philosophically) occupy multiple subject positions and perform various roles in the field (Anderson, 2006). For example, I considered myself as performing the tourist as well as being the researcher. Of course insider status is itself contingent of identity performance(s). As I discuss in chapter five, to the group I was not merely a researcher but also ‘one of them’.

As with Hemmingson (2009), I also consider that as an analytic auto-ethnographer I am always in the field. My lived experience has become over time “a never ending research project that examines…everyday social structures” within the context of those “cultural changes that are moving in the sphere of the self” (2009, p. 10). This presented its own unique problems when negotiating data collection in the group setting (Anderson, 2006). Certainly identity performances were blurred. When initially attempting to be a researcher I found myself necessarily being drawn into and participating heavily in-group activities. This was exacerbated by the sustained periods of time the group interacted and socialised, thus leaving limited (free) time for writing field notes (see chapter three and seven).

There is, of course, debate surrounding the value of analytic auto-ethnography from proponents of evocative auto-ethnography. Denzin (2006, pg. 422), for example, suggests “that it is time to close the door on the Chicago School [of realist ethnography] and all of its variations”. However this is, I would contend, to throw the baby out with the bathwater (Allegue Fuschini, 2009). Moreover, I would point out here that the efficacy of analytic auto-ethnography is about the agency afforded the ‘self’. This is accomplished through acknowledging and making use of interactionism in understanding and
meaning-making through encounters with others (Voloder, 2008). For me, analytic auto-ethnography is about acknowledging the power within (my)self to understand others. As Levinas (1998) contends, one's understanding of the other is essential to one's understanding the self.

2.5.5 Reflexive ethnography and the study of tourists and tourism

Within the tourism academy specifically there appears to have been little interest in employing auto-ethnography (as methodology or method) in the study of tourism or tourists (Morgan and Pritchard, 2005, Wright, 2010). This might be considered somewhat ironic given the opportunities afforded by auto-ethnography for the researcher to both access and indeed, perform the tourist. Of the auto-ethnographies produced within the tourism academy, many have been written post-thesis completion. Given the timing of these publications, coming after successful graduation, and in reading these articles, one might suggest they are a cathartic response to the issues those researchers faced in completing their theses. Common topics covered are explorations of personal issues with the research process along with reflexivity utilised as a way of communicating personal theoretical concerns within the academy (Botterill, 2003, Doloriert and Sambrook, 2011).

It is only relatively recently that there has been explicit recognition, and indeed use, of auto-ethnography as a valid methodological approach within tourism studies. Here I want to introduce particular tourism auto-ethnographies because I feel they, in a way, mirror many objectives of my own use of analytic auto-ethnography. However, I would suggest that few of these auto-ethnographies (rather than autobiographies) truly fit the epithet of being entirely emotive or evocative in the sense proscribed by advocates of personal and highly emotive narrative (Bochner and Ellis, 2002, Denzin, 2006, Ellis, 1999). Rather, these auto-ethnographies retain elements of analytic realist ethnographies. For example, they are often analytical and critical; they may offer
interpretation and moreover, employ a sophisticated reflexivity that invokes interactionism (Anderson, 2006).

Amongst the recent literature engaging with auto-ethnography in tourism studies, Wright (2010), suggests the possibilities of auto-ethnography in researching consumer experiences in leisure and tourism. It is suggested by Westwood (2005) that auto-ethnography is a way to overcome personal (ethical) issues faced by the researcher in interacting with research subjects. Beeton (2008) makes use of personal experiences of film and travel to locate auto-ethnography as an emergent methodology in tourism studies, whilst Morgan and Pritchard (2005), acknowledge the possibilities offered when articulating their place as research subjects and suggest that to do so in a reflexive manner is to “use [their] own lived experience as a resource and to overcome that sense of artificial opaqueness in much tourism scholarship” (p. 35). Making use of rhetoric, Chaim Noy (2008, 2007) uses a particularly personal poem as a way to engage with and challenge dominant representations within tourism discourse with the aim of bringing attention to the performative opportunities offered by auto-ethnography.

By acknowledging and engaging with an auto-ethnographic sensibility, Noy (2008, pg. 154) was encouraged to ask “of tourist representations of experiences not what they are but what are they for; not what they mean (subsequently conceptualizing intricate typologies thereof), but how are they (re)employed or (re)mobilized”. More recently Scarles (2010), furthered the potential of such methodologies when exploring the use of visual ethnographic methods as part of the auto-ethnographic study of tourism. Here she suggested visual auto-ethnography as a way of mobilising “spaces of understanding; transcending limitations of verbal discourse and opening spaces for mutual appreciation and reflection” (pg. 1).

It follows that auto-ethnography can offer interesting possibilities in the production of tourism knowledge. Certainly, auto-ethnography should appeal to many contemporary
tourism researchers as it is “an emotionally invested, experiential perspective...grounded in place, saturated with local specificity” and offers insights into “the ebb and flow of daily life and what is going on behind the scenes” (Butz, 2010, p. 151).

It is important to remember that for many (western) academics, both those who study tourism and others as well, that the phenomenon of tourism is part and parcel of one’s own everyday life. Certainly as academics, many of us attend conferences; move to and from (and through) possible research settings outside of universities/places of work. Furthermore, many of us actively engage in tourism as a leisure activity, subsequently (and possibly unreflexively) performing the tourist subject. As Urry suggests, we are tourists much of the time. Indeed, in an auto-ethnography on academic life, Pelias, (2003) uses tourism as a metaphor to liken the performance of the academic researcher to that of the tourist. It is somewhat of a paradox then that it is left to those outside of the tourism academy to recognise and mobilise these opportunities.

2.6 Summary

In this chapter I have set out how I as an individual come to knowledge and meaning making. Where ‘I’ fit in the world regarding reality, my philosophical, epistemological and methodological position if you will. This is important as it in turn informs the production and interpretation of empirical and other data within the thesis.

Of particular importance has been my discussion on the suitability of reflexive ethnographic methodologies – and specifically analytic auto-ethnography - as an appropriate approach for the study of the micro-social aspects of the tourist’s daily life-on-the-road. For me, it is the most suitable approach as it allows me to attend to the detail, the nitty gritty if you will, of everyday life. Moreover, it allows me to not only ‘follow the tourist’, but to also make use of my own readings of the world around me,
including my past experiences of tourism (and hospitality) from the perspective of producer and consumer, or work and leisure.

Whilst often the relationship between research question or thesis objective and methodology is a linear one, for me the process was one that I like to think became be dialogic, the process ‘spoke’ to me. Whilst I was aware of my personal philosophical position, my methodological position was often in-flux. If one thinks of knowledge as (partially) emerging from the research process, so my methodological position evolved throughout the thesis.

I have mentioned philosophy in the previous paragraph. Such a brief invocation, almost as if in passing, is to neglect its importance in this chapter, the thesis and indeed my world. I had always wondered why I think the way I do For me, this chapter has itself become, to an extent, not only cathartic but also enriching. It has allowed me the space (and time) to work through my existence in the world and if not more importantly, how I make sense of encounters and the goings on around me (something I discuss further in chapter seven when I write on identity).

Given my discussion in chapter one as well as this chapter, I do not separate my researcher/academic self from those of any other roles I perform. Rather, I see these in continual flux and negotiation. One might suggest that my lived experiences are part and parcel of a rehearsed life (Abrahams, 2005). Thus I do not see my research as having been conducted within a particular place or field, (or for that matter time). Rather, the research project has been constructed and mediated over an extended period of time, and from within multiple spaces and places.

The search for possible ‘meeting’ sites along with thinking about whom I would meet happened in the context of performing (and performed) multiple identities. However, I found that the methodologies and methods employed by previous research in this area
did not allow me the opportunity to develop any depth as to the phenomenon I wanted to at least try to understand. After all, whilst everyday life is replete with banal performances, it is also often intensely intimate. In order to get some grasp on the issues at hand, I needed to become embedded in the research; to become an embodied researcher (Coffey, 1999, Spry, 2001, Conquergood, 2006). But whose bodies was I inhabiting and performing?

In the following chapter, I turn to methods and data collection. In particular I will discuss and make problematic the concept of fieldwork (and data) as it holds for this thesis. After all, past experiences construct knowledge prior to any fieldwork, and certainly from an auto-ethnographic praxis, cannot be subdued as they become critical to understanding and interpreting interactions, as well as important spaces of/for meaning to be explored.
Chapter Three: **Work in the ‘field’**

### 3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I set out the practical aspects of the study: how research was carried out, the sites and spaces of data collection and the research practice(s) along with a discussion of ethics. As with other parts of the wider thesis project, the research itself was not limited to a defined or delineated point in time. This thesis is, after all, a reflexive (as well as on-going) project and therefore contingent on multiple times. Understanding this is important as data is crucial to, and prior to, analysis. Moreover, for me, planning fieldwork and methods was an opportunity for data collection. I have therefore tried wherever possible to employ (and maintain) a sense of chronology throughout this chapter. In effect I wish to bring to the fore a sense of the temporality of data collection for this thesis. In doing so I want to think of the wider ethics as more-than-procedural and (hopefully) begin to engage in an “ethics in practice” (Guillemin and Gillam, 2004, pg. 262). Thus in this chapter I want to participate in what Hertz (1997, pg. viii) suggests as “an ongoing conversation about experience while simultaneously living in the moment”.

This chapter follows on from my discussion in chapter two. It focusses on how I have gone about operationalising the reflexive methodologies I engage(d) with. Specifically I want to situate my multiple (and contested) selves, methods and subsequent data as “reflexively interdependent and interconnected” (Mauthner and Doucet, 2003, p. 144). In so doing, I aim to foreground the wider interpersonal, social and institutional contexts that inform both my research and the (micro and macro) spaces within which I have produced this thesis.

I have included an extended discussion concerning the type of participant observation I have carried out as I feel it germane to the reader’s understanding of my position within
the research especially given my wish to be a part of the group under scrutiny. Furthermore, as this is a reflexive ethnography the discussion plays a key part in authenticating the thesis (Holt, 2003). I follow this by engaging with my multiple and often contesting identities and how these roles shaped the meetings that occurred as part of my working at research. Thus I present the methods that enabled me to think and write through my interactions with others inside and outside of these meetings (including those who might read this thesis) as well as to develop some sense of understanding of my role formation and identity practices, performed as part of this process.

When I set out to write this chapter I had a conscious desire to challenge conventional research terminologies and the constructs commonly used in gaining knowledge of tourism and tourists. Thus it should be no surprise when the methods (or meetings) introduced in this chapter do not follow the traditions of either the realist roots of anthropologic ethnography (Van Maanen, 1995), or the practices of the emotive auto-ethnographer. However, rather than seeing these perspectives as necessarily dichotomous, I suggest that the best of each can be recognised and moreover contribute to a series of practices that offer different ways of creating (auto) and seeing (ethno) data. Integrated in this discussion I consider benefits and problems with researching what are, at least on the surface, closed, small communities such as the fully inclusive group tour (FIGT).

3.2 Towards meetings in action

Rather than giving priority to research as being in the field, I wanted to make use of the concept of meetings. Meetings are not only the places, but also the spaces of “direct engagement between the self and others, or, indeed, between different aspects of the self” (Johnson et al., 2004, pg. 201). Importantly for me the idea of meetings “attends to the relational or dialogic aspects” (pg. 201), that exists between ethnography as method
and methodology and fieldwork as practice. I locate this concept as central to my reflexive position on encounters (Scott, 2006a), and where possible, want to make this explicit in my research philosophy. For me, thinking of meeting(s) offered exciting opportunities to rethink the field as a site for encounters between self, other, material culture and space. Moreover, as with Johnson et al (2004), this concept of meetings is useful to me in foregrounding and making clear relations and confrontations between “different aspects of the self” (pg. 202). In beginning my discussion on situating the research I want to emphasise that thinking about where and when I did this research did much to define the subjects and objects of the research (Burrell, 2009).

Thinking in this way encouraged me to contemplate in advance those schizophrenic experiences that are prone to happening when one researches at ‘home’ (Hoodfar, 1994, Youngblood Jackson, 2008). For me, this meant encounters to which I would be subject to as I set about (co)constructing identity roles (including as researcher) during meetings in space(s) that I consider a sort of home. For example, locations of touristic performance such as the hotel and the tour coach, as both sites of work, but also daily life that have been part of my life for over twenty years. For me, the site of my meetings needed to be considered as existing in spaces (and performances) that were both home and away (Caputo, 2000). This imagining is of course implicated in how I situated and presented (gave voice to) my multiple identities before, during and after meeting(s).

3.2.1 Field(s) of inquiry

From the very start of planning my research, my objective had been to understand the relationship between everyday life and the tourists’ performance of identity. In the first instance my thoughts had been about observing, participating and analysing performances within the hotel. After all, I had intimate knowledge of such spaces and my initial questioning had arisen within these spaces (please see chapter one). Moreover, there are numerous representations of the hotel as seemingly the antithesis of home (Pritchard, 2006), as a space of difference and thus (supposedly) proving a contrast to
everyday life at home. However, I quickly realised that this limited my opportunities to understand how the banal performances of the everyday were enacted and given meaning. Whilst I could certainly go and sit in hotel lounges (McKinney, 1966), even stay overnight and observe performances during various times of the day, I would be limited to interacting with a series of ever changing actors over a short period of time (given that in many cases the average length of stay in the types of hotels I wanted to use was two days). As such my interactions would be limited to fleeting encounters (Rapport, 2002). The mobile nature of tourism again foregrounding the issues of geographical dispersal and distant(ciated) relationships between researcher and researched. Given that proximity, both temporal and spatial would be limited, the possibilities of meaningful dialogic encounters would be made difficult. The transitory nature of meetings would thus challenge the need for a common language (Calder, 2003), in turn reducing the opportunity for intersubjective performances to occur.

Reflecting on everyday life necessitated my thinking about opportunities that would allow me to engage with the same individuals for continuous periods of time. Where, for example, would I be able to see tourists performing the banal activities of everyday life? I needed, as Meged (2010, pg. 40) suggests, to find a way to “follow in the footsteps of...tourists”. Moreover one’s everyday life is made up not only of human performances and interactions, but also of a multitude of encounters with the stuff that, on the surface, appears superficial, yet are implicated in facilitating daily life and its attendant practices (Miller, 2009b). Thus I needed to think about spaces where I could also follow the stuff (Cook, 2006) of the tourist; for example suitcases, cameras, laundry and messages home.

What I really sought was the ability to spend extended periods of time with the same group of people - to become part of a community of practice. The problem of where to collect data became one of finding spaces that enabled me to observe and interact with a limited number of individuals over an extended period of time. In thinking about potential sites for research I was reminded of Becker’s (1999) discussion on the
supposed romance of anthropological ethnography versus the luxury of sociological ethnography where one can sleep in one’s own bed and eat one’s own food. In my research I would be cosseted in my own world (please see chapter four).

In order to obtain the depth of data, I needed to think of how I might engage in multiple performances over an extended period of time in multiple spaces and with a clearly defined group of people. Ideally I wanted space(s) that allowed me, whilst encountering and interacting with others, to attend to the more-than-representational, to think about opportunities where I might be able to highlight the embodied, affective and performative characteristics of daily life (Lorimer, 2005, Laurier et al., 2008, Anderson and Harrison, 2010, Lorimer, 2010). Such spaces of encounter would, I hoped, allow me to also "examine what and how [tourists] do things, corporeally, socially and in conjunction with non-humans" (Haldrup and Larsen, 2009, p. XX). Consequently, this resulted in my thinking of the possibilities afforded by a tour group as a space for observing and partaking of the everyday life of the tourist.

3.3 The fully inclusive group tour (FIGT)

Simply put, a FIGT tour is the combination of transport and support activities that is packaged and sold to the tourist. From a functionalist perspective, the group tour solves problems for tourists – it serves to simplify purchasing decisions for the consumer. Land transport, food, accommodation and often entrance to attractions is included in the price. As such, the tour package is suggested as providing the tourist not merely consumer choice but also offers “psychological security... provided through the itinerary and knowing beforehand just where one will be going and in what hotels one will be staying” (Schmidt, 1979, pg. 443). Moreover, the trip is paid up-front removing the uncertainty of costs along the way (Mak et al., 2011). Travelling in this way also allows decisions to be made by the organisation in selecting destinations and ‘sites’ and acts to manage social encounters between the touring and toured (Edensor, 2000). In addition, the package
tour provides a secure space in which to perform the role of tourist, enabled through the work of the tour guide, permitting the tourist to consume cultural experiences, adventure and multiple other tourist performances (Meged, 2010, Larsen and Meged, 2013)

Previous research using package or group tours has included; understanding the tour within the context of the experience economy (Xu and Chan, 2010); the performance and role of the tour guide (Holloway, 1981, Songshan et al, 2010); interactions between the tour guide, driver and passengers, (Gorman, 1979), and the relationship between tour groups, identity and place (Tucker, 2007, 2005). Much of this, and other current research emphasises the role of the tour group in facilitating outbound travel from developing markets (Wang et al., 2002, Wong and Lau, 2001, Wang et al., 2000).

Given the breadth of research carried out both on and within group tours, it is interesting that there appears to be little attention paid to the performances associated with the mundane activities of everyday life. Whilst there are earlier works on the social aspects of group tours, especially those of Gorman (1979), Holloway (1981) and Schmidt (1979), these were conducted before the turn to, and interest in, developing a sociological understanding of the minutiae of everyday life (Jacobsen, 2009).

There have been previous suggestions as to the efficacy of the FIGT for tourism research when Seaton (2002, pg. 311) suggested:

The hermetic quality of a tour party makes it, from the researcher's point of view, a quintessential travelling laboratory for academics wishing to understand the dynamics of tourism in natural settings, and the specific features and motivations attached to the many and particular forms of tourism around which conducted tours take place.
The suggestion of the FIGT as a kind of social science laboratory, for me, is somewhat problematic as it (pre)constructs the role of the researcher, situated and performing as (uncritical) observer in what is suggested as a naturalistic setting. Furthermore, it suggests that what happens within the tour can be viewed and analysed objectively. This exteriorisation of the researcher was problematised by immersing myself in the tour as a full participant and providing (through various methodologies) a narrative from the perspective of a group member (Anderson, 2006, Adler and Adler, 1987”). Thus I was able to move “researcher subjectivity towards the centre of the research process” to where I could become the “researcher-as-tourist” (Scarles, 2010, pg. 911). Moreover, I could do so whilst also being aware of and attending to Crang's (2003) assertion of the impossibility of the researcher-as-insider.

By choosing a fully inclusive tour it allowed me the space to understand how individuals (including myself) make social investments in the performance of the everyday through text, discourse and practice (Scott, 2009). For a period of time I was able to share transport, dining and even others private spaces such as the hotel bedroom. As such the FIGT, as a bordered entity, offered me opportunities to explore performances of the banal through the interiorisation of the group (McCarthy, 2005). In addition, the FIGT offered the potential for mobile research encounters (and the use of mobile methods) that generated meaningful understandings of everyday life. I was able to encounter and interact in exchanges that were full of interruptions and disruptions, and where the intimate became intermingled with the mundane (Ross et al., 2008, Ross et al., 2009). Moreover, the FIGT allowed me opportunities to “extend the scope of the ethnography” from purely social actors, to include also “travelling objects” (Haldrup and Larsen, 2009), the stuff or material culture that we carry with us when elsewhere.

Thus I approached the FIGT on the basis that the tour group (as I show in chapter five) comprises multiple mobilities (both corporeal and otherwise) and would offer the opportunity to observe and participate in a variety of different settings (private space,
public space, coach, bar, restaurant, spa, hotel room) which enabled a rich and varied narrative to appear. Moreover, this sensitised me to the emergence of multiple and often contested identities. Being a fully paid-up member of a FIGT allowed me to not only participate in and capture the dialogic encounter, but also, as importantly, to understand the socio-spatial contingencies – how my mobile (displaced) encounters and role performances might exist as a dialectic relation to place (Chih Hoong, 2003).

Immersion in what I considered a semi-known, but prior to fieldwork a resisted space (the FIGT), also encouraged me to become a reflexive subject (see chapter seven for a detailed discussion). Whilst my own ontological security is certainly not challenged within space(s) of (commercial) hospitality (the hotel for example); undertaking a tour disrupted many of my personal historic reference points that I carried with me into the field. Whilst past lived experience (along with future imaginings, see for example chapter four) informs my performance and interactions within hotels, this knowledge was disrupted in becoming and being part of a community in the multiple and contested space of the FIGT. As such, interacting with those travelling on FIGT’s enabled me to re-situate and re-think the hotel as a key part of my life. It also constructed new borders and spaces that permitted me to interact with others in ways that I had not done prior to this research.

Importantly the FIGT enabled access to what were potentially dialogic spaces outside of the hotel; spaces in which mundane performances might be carried out, such as on the coach or at stopping points. Finally, whilst conducted over a finite period of time, the group tour can be considered a period of intensive interaction that presented opportunities for the construction of highly personal and intimate relationships (Gorman, 1979). This was certainly borne out by the amount of time I physically spent with fellow tour members and the personal relationships I established.
3.3.1 Multiple sites of data collection

How I (socially) constructed the sites of meetings and encounters is implicated in how I (re)represent knowledge within this thesis. It is through understanding the tour as a spatial dialectic (Lefebvre, 1991) that I recognised the potential of including representations of (the multiple) spaces of the FIGT. For me, to think of the field, or meetings, as a single site is to fall into the trap of reductionism. The field is often considered as a Cartesian space, a space to be entered into and subsequently returned from. To consider the field in this way would have been to ignore my situatedness (and context) as both researcher and subject, and would furthermore have been a challenge to my reflexive consideration of encounters, both current and past.

Whilst acknowledging the increasing focus on reflexivity within the academy, I wanted to attend to the call for embodied representation of spaces and sites of encounter and interaction (Waskul and Vannini, 2007) and the possibilities this might present in my search for knowledge. I needed to think of sites of research and meetings as fluid and dynamic, thus needing to be operationalised through a politics of representation. Therefore, in this thesis I think of space (the field) as being conceived, perceived and lived (Lefebvre, 1991). Hence, it consisted not merely of the physical co-presence of fellow passengers, but also the assemblages that went towards the tour and indeed the research process.

The FIGT consists of multiple spaces, not merely of performance (the tour itself) but also of imagining. Whilst I have located the FIGT as one site of inquiry, I made use of multiple spaces of data collection. In addition to the tour itself the sites of data collection included spaces of planning and decision-making, for example the tour brochure and indeed the body itself.
3.4 Operationalising meetings

When attempting to access a FIGT it quickly became apparent that whilst gaining access as a consumer would be relatively simple, constrained only by my budget; the same could not be said about my role as researcher. As I contacted numerous travel agents it became apparent that access to tours was, as Frohlick and Harrison (2008, p. 6) suggest, "protected by those who had a vested interest in keeping tourists to themselves, or in mediating the tourists' experiences in order to profit from them"; in my case the tour companies themselves. As such I also began to make contact with personnel at the tour companies. Rather pragmatically, I chose the tour based on the first company that allowed me to purchase a seat and to participate as a researcher. Prior to this approval, I corresponded directly with the managing director of the company, based in the Bahamas, and at the request of the tour company, conducted a telephone conversation with the New Zealand based manager. The following excerpt is taken from correspondence with the New Zealand manager allowing my participation, as researcher, on the tour:

Further to our discussion, we’d like to welcome you on board one of our tours with the understanding that you keep your research low profile and do not impact the enjoyment of the other tour participants. We’d like it to be clear that it is not [the company] undertaking the research.

This begins to illustrate the tensions inherent in researchers trying to gain access to tourists (Harrison, 2001, Harrison, 2003, Frohlick and Harrison, 2008).

The tour I was given permission to join was a 15-day escorted fully inclusive tour through Turkey. On the tour I participated as a full fare-paying passenger. The details of the tour are outlined below\(^\text{14}\) (see plate 3.1 for a trajectory of the tour)

\(^{14}\) I discuss the 'group' members in detail in chapter five.
Days started at 6:30am with breakfast in the hotel dining room – normally with a minimum of 9 people through to the complete group of 36 (not including the driver or tour director). We would then leave the hotel, more often than not around 8am. The day would include travelling, punctuated with stops dependent upon the itinerary as well as a small number of unplanned stops (see chapter six). We would arrive at our next hotel at approximately 5pm where, after a period 'making home', many of us would convene in the hotel bar before joining the remainder of the group for dinner. After dinner there were again opportunities to converse with fellow group members in the bar or on occasion in other's rooms (see chapter five). My day with fellow travellers very rarely finished before 11pm and I could therefore be in contact with group members anywhere from 12 hours up to 18 hours on any given day. This resulted in a substantial amount of
recorded and written data. As I discuss later in this chapter (as well as in more detail in chapter seven) in performing the role of researcher-as-tourist I took numerous photographs and videos. In total I collected over 3000 images and 2 hours of video. Written data consisted of 4 journals worth of notes.

3.5 Methods

Given my focus on reflexivity I sought to make problematic the methods I would use to understand and record the social construction of everyday space and concomitant performances of the individual-as-tourist. This necessarily included the need for a variety of data gathering strategies, often associated with different ethnographic methods. Given my need to understand micro-social performances of my own and others everyday lives on tour, it is important to acknowledge here that meetings were often carried out under chaotic conditions.

As the FIGT intertwines mobilities and immobilities, my engagement with the literature on mobile methods and methodologies became an encouraging way to think through my data collection(s). Mobile methods allowed me to think about ways I could attempt to uncover knowledge by understanding:

that my going on tour was a shared experiential journey and thus offered meaningful understandings of both my and others everyday life; place-making interactions are rooted in people’s everyday locales, for example the home, and are (re)configured/reconstituted whilst on tour; my exchanges whilst on tour (and before/after) would be full of interruptions and disruptions; the intimate and mundane would be interspersed with periods of the ‘exotic’; And how movement and interactivity might allow myself and other group members to express both closeness and distance (Research Journal).
Thinking about these aspects and thinking about how there was a common theme to do with performance and embodied interaction encouraged me to look for, and to utilise, methods that would capture the complexities of the (multi-sensory) research encounter (Binnie et al., 2007).

3.5.1 Attending to the multi-sensory

It has been suggested that the study of culture is “impossible without retaining the moment of the symbolic: with the textual, language, subjectivity and representation forming the key matrix” (Hall and Du Gay, 1996, pg. 403). However, I needed to ensure my methods did not privilege space, voice, performance or materiality. Rather, in order to achieve my objective I needed to include multiple methods and data sources in order to capture the complexities and more-than-representational characteristics that make up everyday lived experiences. For example, and as I have introduced earlier, data included not merely the knowledge gained from the tour itself, but also those times and spaces which give it context; media representations such as the tour brochure, travelogues, and previous experiences of both (my)self as researcher and those around me. As such I had to think past exteriorising (i.e. representational) aspects of material culture and consider how I might attend to the sensuousness of everyday human experience (Willis, 2000).

Given that I wanted to explore the embodied experience of everyday life how, for example, could I collect and make sense of smells, touch and sounds that make up everyday life. Moreover, how might they be given positionality within the narrative(s) of the thesis, and importantly, how would I ensure they were not neglected or relegated to being just background fabric of the research?

I began to think through how engaging with the silenced performances of everyday life on tour might allow me to attend to the sensuous. I found Sullivan and Gill’s claim that “sight paints a picture of life, but sound, touch, taste and smell are life itself” (in Rodaway, 1994, pg. 4) a rather useful way to consider daily life of the tour. Likewise it offered the potential to recognise how my hearing, touch, smell, and taste might be made
use of (and heightened) (Paterson, 2009) and in turn, highlight particularities of everyday life. This led me to position the body as a research tool and to think about how I might attend to sensuous geographies of the everyday in new ways including making use of sensuous ethnography (Pink, 2009) rather than merely privileging parts of the body – for example the ocular and aural (Highmore, 2002a).

More often than not in attempting to understand the tourist, the body is dis-placed from the research endeavour. It is as if the body has become a "ghostly absence" (Crang, 2003, pg. 499), yet the body is integral to both the tourist’s social identity and to their encounters with others (human and material culture). Likewise for much research the body of the researcher is equally absent, or if present limited to the eyes and ears! In coming to understand everyday life and identity on tour it is important to acknowledge:

the [ethnographic] researcher’s body is immersed in the field and is simultaneously outside the research (by means of its strangeness and lack of knowledge) and in the research. If this juxtaposition can be recognised and examined reflexively, it can bring many more issues to the surface than a more controlled method, such as the static interview might generate (Thomas and Ahmed, 2004, pg. 3).

I thus needed to think how I could position myself as a researcher to ensure that “smells, tastes, gestures, reactions, clothing, glances and touches [that] often slip away unnoticed and/or undocumented” (Longhurst et al., 2008, pg. 208) might be brought to account. This would ensure that the sensuousness of my/our performances on tour, the touch of a menu, the smell of clean linen, the noise of the coach, the taste of a ‘strange’ dish, were recorded and placed in the narrative of the thesis. I hoped that by employing participant observation as *embodied* practice, that I would garner an insight into the multidimensionality of the tour. After all, as Rodaway (1994, pg. 5), reminds us, “everyday experience is multi sensual”.
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A reason for choosing to do my research in a FIGT was that it I felt it lent itself to the use of participant observation. That is, in part I had initially thought of method prior to where I would employ those methods. In considering the FIGT, I thought it would offer me the potential to engage in various levels of participation or observation (from fully immersed to fully removed). However, in reality my position within this dichotomy fluctuated from moment to moment (or more specifically event to event; see chapter five for example).

3.5.2 Taking part – participant observation

A number of previous studies of individuals’ in FIGT have utilised what they considered unobtrusive participant observation (Bowen, 2002, Seaton, 2002), often as a condition of accessing the tour (Holloway, 1981). However, in many cases the performance of unobtrusive(ness) was considered of importance primarily during the performance of the research whilst mobile. As such, interviews were limited to engaging with participants during meal breaks and at tourist sites/sights.

I found that Adler and Adler’s (1987) ideas on researcher positionality presented an alternative means to situate myself as both a researcher, a tourist and as (hopefully) part of the group. Being a “complete-member-researcher (CMR)” (Adler and Adler, 1987, pg. 67), also allowed me to make sense of the multiple identities that I was required to perform before, during and after the fieldwork. As I anticipated overtly performing a “genuine commitment to the group” (although see chapter five) it encouraged me to be open about my role as both a researcher and group member whilst in the field\textsuperscript{15}. Likewise the nature of the package tour and my interest in the performance of the minutiae of everyday life enabled me to remain in-situ; I did not need to experience or deal with the shock of repeatedly entering or leaving the field. Likewise I had thought

\textsuperscript{15}Whilst I had anticipated ‘declaring’ my researcher identity at the start of the tour, due to my early non-performance of tourist and group member (see chapter five for detailed discussion) my performance as researcher in the tour became a ‘focus’ of conversation.
the temporal nature of the tour might limit any issues I would face in the final withdrawing, as a member, from 'my' group (Iversen, 2009). However, this was not the case (please see Chapter Seven).

I felt it important that I undertake the tour as a CMR as I needed to think about daily interactions as spaces where not only would I encounter others, but these encounters needed to be considered as embodied (Gibson, 2009); manifest through reflection, interaction and observation of those around me. As such, my part in the group was dependent upon my playing the part of what of a full member should do and thus gave me opportunities to think in a reflexive manner about my and others performances as full group members. This was a process that started prior to the tour (please see chapter four). For example, in considering ethics I needed to reflect upon how the methods I had chosen had, to a greater or lesser extent, been dictated by the potential needs of my fellow tourists/social actors (Harrison, 2001).

In aiming to be an unobtrusive researcher I needed to be aware of, and ensure, that anything I did was not intrusive to others (or my?) enjoyment – after all, as a group, we were all ostensibly on holiday. This included thinking through issues that might occur in the field and developing coping strategies prior to entering the group. Importantly, adopting full participation allowed me to fulfil the criteria suggested by Anderson (2006) for analytic auto-ethnography. Namely, that I could be a complete member of the group whilst maintaining my ability to collect data through engagement in dialogic encounters with others.

Oral data came from a combination of sources; from spontaneous conversations with others (Meged, 2010) to conversations that were overheard (Li, 2008)\(^\text{16}\). This was important to me as I was not only after information or data about performances of group

\(^{16}\)This research was approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee (see also 3.7)
member’s daily lives when playing the role of tourist (the role institutionally ascribed to them) but to also determine what they (we) actually did during daily life on tour. Thus in using conversations that were overheard I made use of shadowing as a data collection technique (Quinlan, 2008). Through engaging in other methods of listening, I was able to get to culture in action rather than relying on the often problematic answers to questions about the tourist day gathered through (monologic) interviews (Jerolmack and Khan, 2014).

3.5.3 Visual ethnography

Participant observation makes use of both the ocular and aural in the process of gathering data. In this section, I want to discuss how I made use of visual ethnographic methods more specifically. Whilst CMR was the primary strategy in creating space for meetings and data collection during the tour, I also deployed a number of methods to aid collection as well as providing opportunities to understand everyday experiences. Photography, as one such visual method, has enhanced my understanding of the data (and what data is!) and my subsequent engagement with the interpretation and discussions of images. My inclusion and use of images as data within the thesis is based within Pink’s three considerations required for visual analysis (Pink, 2007). First, that capturing encounters or experiences through visual technologies cannot be considered in any way objective; secondly, the context within which visual images are captured should be analysed reflexively; finally, the focus of analysis should not only be on the captured images, but also on the meanings taken from the images by different individuals, including the reader.

I used visual methods for a number of reasons. To me, as a researcher and on tour as a complete member, it was an integral part of the overall experience. It has, after all, been suggested that tourist photography can be considered the defining work of contemporary tourism (Urry, 2002b, Osborne, 2000 and see chapter seven). Through photography as ubiquitous performance (Hand, 2012), I considered that the distinction
between my position as observer (researcher) and observed (tourist) collapsed (Conquergood, 2006). This enabled me to include photographs (both as method and within the thesis) without uncritically privileging either context or content. In this thesis it was important for me to make use of “visual media to express and interrogate varied geographies through [the] aesthetics” (Crang, 2003, pg. 501) of the socio-spatialities of our daily lives on tour.

In the context of the tour, it can be suggested that taking photographs remained, to a greater or lesser extent, unobtrusive, as the ubiquity of its practice was something that was expected of me. Moreover, this included not merely taking images of tourist sites and sights but also taking photographs of each other (Osborne, 2000). Put another way, to not take photographs might have seemed a little strange. In fact, performing the tourist as well as researcher resulted in me taking a substantial amount of photographs of tourist sights, something I had resisted in my other travels. Of course I had observed numerous tour members taking photographs whilst working in hotels. This included portrait and group shots of each other, photographs of hotel interiors and exteriors through to individuals taking photographs of what they and others were eating in the restaurant.

Given my interest in the performance of the everyday in, and of, the FIGT, the material culture of these spaces of encounter were also of interest when taking photographs. In particular it gave me the opportunity to capture the “architecture, furnishings, displays of artefacts...textures” (Penaloza, 1998, pg. 340), this was important as material culture is implicated in the performance of everyday life (please see chapter five). It was notable that given both the ubiquity of tourist photography, and increasingly photography in and of daily life (Hand, 2012), that my research performance which was initially overt for me became, in many ways, covert. Whilst I informed my fellow passengers what I was doing, my photography was itself an everyday practice of the tourist and soon became background (please see chapter seven).
Importantly, with regards to the collection of data, my fellow group members became involved in the production and collection of visual data throughout (and after) the tour. Such collaborative photography allowed (my)self and others representation (with)in the data, whilst maintaining an ethics of representation. None of my fellow group members were asked to take photographs; rather through their usual performances of photography they became to all intents and purposes co-researchers. Whilst I did not seek these, photographs that were taken by fellow group members were subsequently forwarded to me post tour. These photographs were emailed to me with a message that the sender hoped they would prove useful to me. When I have used these images they have been attributed to the relevant individual.

Photography, as a visual method, allowed me to convey a sense of the places (and spaces) in which the group-as-community operated. As Payne, (1991, pg. 18) points out, “humans see as well as hear and think. If the locality is relevant, then it is even more important than in other walks of sociology to see what it looks like”.

3.5.4 Writing down as method and data

The purpose of this section is to make problematic the taken-for-grantedness of note taking, or writing down (Emerson et al., 2011), during research. This corresponds to a move away from the dominance of “participant observation to the observation-of-participation” and to an emphasis on the processes of writing” (Ellis and Bochner, 2003, pg. 212). I wanted to do this in order to situate my performance of writing as ‘data’, not just as descriptive writing or descriptive text on what was happening. Writing itself became a way to blur the boundaries between fieldwork and analysis. Moreover, I wanted to make use of writing as a process, which sought to ask why something might be unique to this (or that) space. Thus, thinking about the act of writing enhanced my questioning of the theory that might be called upon to develop (deeper) understandings of the phenomenon (identity construction for example) under study. To me writing was (and remains) a way of thinking about the entire study as micro-social, but also as a
series of micro-micro-social encounters. As such I feel it is important that I made use of not only descriptive writing, capturing acts and encounters whilst I (and others) were elsewhere, but also that I write as a way of working through why (meaning) and how (experiences) are unique to my research setting. As importantly, (if not more so) engaging in reflexive writing provided me a method to deal with knowledge construction when dealing with the crisis of representation (Ellis and Bochner, 2003, Ellis et al., 2011). After all, writing itself is political. It captures not only data, but how one writes something down can itself be considered data (Nystrand and Duffy, 2003).

Wolfinger (2002) suggests two distinct strategies that might be utilised by the researcher writing in the field. Writing those experiences that are salient to the researcher – things that are given priority, and secondly, comprehensive note taking which has the “advantage of forcing an ethnographer to recreate events in the order they really happened” (pg. 92). I chose to employ the idea of comprehensive writing of notes via my use of on-going journal entries as it allowed me to think about and begin ‘analysis’ during the trip itself.

I made use of multiple types of written notes. For example, action notes where I included times of stopping and starting written whilst becoming im-mobile on the coach. Of course other contextual aspects of the tour were also important and captured, through notes of accumulative interactions as a way to think through the temporal spaces. Secondly, these were augmented with notes, written up during periods of movement of the coach, at each stop, and at the beginning and end of each day. Finally further notes were made of emerging themes.

Writing strategies included substantive field notes, methodological field notes and analytic memos (Burgess, 1982, Healy et al., 2012). These were written up during periods of movement on the coach, at each stop, and at the beginning and end of each day. My observation as researcher as well as participation as a group member, as I have
discussed above, was carried out from the start of the day until often into the early the following morning. This, however, was not something I had planned for, nor created strategies to deal with in the planning phase – rather it was something that had to be dealt with in-situ.

By thinking of, and imagining, the realities of research prior to fieldwork I was able to recognise a number of potential issues. For example, the time and space needed to write. However as I started performing the researcher, writing as data brought to the fore the extent to which writing itself is, for many tourists, an everyday performance and indeed becomes part of the routinised behaviour of the tour through personal diaries or journals. Thus the tension I expected between my ability to achieve writing as a researcher was facilitated by my very performance as tourist (see plate 3.3).

Plate 3.3 Journal writing as everyday touristic life

Whilst time away from fellow group members was scarce, writing in journals, as with tourist photography, is often part and parcel of the daily life of the tourist. Thus the work of research provided opportunities to perform multiple identities simultaneously.
As such what to write about, how I should write 'it', how I might cope with the process of developing a written narrative (Emerson et al., 2011) were elements of my everyday life on tour. I found it interesting therefore, that writing in the field appears of little consequence in much contemporary social science (Wolfinger, 2002). Maybe the everydayness of writing-as-practice relegates it to the banal as we wrestle with the how we represent the voices in our final publication – whether that be thesis, journal article, report. There is a taken-for-grantedness of writing that situates it as secondary to the witness of the senses, the verbalisation, the gaze, the hearing, the touching of the subject.
Reflecting on my past (and the processes involved in reflexivity and auto-ethnography) encouraged me to precede thinking of writing on the tour, with writing into the tour. That is, how I (pre)constructed the tour through writing. What role did my (past) lived experiences play in informing my expectations and creation of writing strategies for example? I suppose I consider, in my role of researcher, that writing into the community allowed me to think through the idea of field or meetings in relation to practice (Warde, 2004). This in turn facilitated my working through what came to be a recurring issue of borders and boundaries. How, for example, I might (and indeed should) challenge the privileging of the corporeal (felt) mobility, or the domination of the visual (Urry, 2011). For me, this is to question the idea of my fellow passengers being absent from my research (and thus the thesis) until I had physically entered the field. As I was writing this chapter I found myself reflecting on how what I was writing was itself a form of field note. How do I choose what is salient for inclusion in the chapter? How do I think through this in ethical terms? What do you, the reader, need to know? How much is too much? Equally important is the consideration of how thinking of processes as data changes the role of writing about research into being more than just an outline of methods and, as such, as much open to analysis as the later chapters dealing with data.

3.6 Analysis – writing up

In this section my focus is on discussing the practice(s) of analysis and interpretation of data. I then engage with interpretation from a theoretical perspective in order to highlight how interpretation is, for me at least, a process that is ongoing. In the context of this thesis data collection, analysis and interpretation as an “experience doesn’t need to be coded to be appreciated and understood, it needs to be presented and treated as being just what it is” (Dewsbury, 2010, pg. 325). As Coffey and Atkinson (Coffey and Atkinson, pg. 6) argue, the practice of analysis:

*should not be seen as a distinct stage of research; rather, it is a reflexive activity that should inform data collection, writing, further data collection, and so forth. Analysis is not, then,*
the last phase of the research process. It should be seen as part of the research design and of the data collection. The research process, of which analysis is one aspect, is a cyclical one. Thinking about analysis and interpretation in this way encouraged me to become attuned to what Gubrium and Hostein (2013) suggest as ‘analytic inspiration’.

I began analysis and interpretation for this thesis long before I entered the field. As I discuss in chapter one, this thesis, including how I went about research, has been heavily influenced by my previous life (Botterill, 2000). However, rather than the processes of my interpretation remaining, like many qualitative studies, invisible (Blunt, 2003) I wanted to foreground what I did in order to make sense of the data. This is not to imply that interpretation and analysis for this thesis somehow happened at one point in time and as part of a linear process - for example that of sitting at a desk on my return from the field and sifting through data. Rather I wanted to as MacKian (2010) suggests, move past the mechanistic performance of analysis and interpretation and discuss the transformative processes bound up in interpretation and analysis that occurred throughout the entirety of the thesis journey (and which have yet to cease) and indeed, saturated my research process.

Although MacKian's (2010) understanding of analysis is focused on being external to data collection; the process of, amongst others, “coding, cutting, grouping, tallying of the out-thereness of the data” (pg. 360), for me analysis was integral to my fieldwork (Gubrium and Holstein, 2013). Interpretation is where I was looking for (and presenting) “understanding or explanation beyond the limits of what can be explained with the degree of certainty usually associated with analysis” (Wolcott, 1994, pg. 10/11). In doing so I engaged with the messiness of data where my aim was to “move analysis into interpretation” (MacKian, 2010, emphasis in original).

My analysis and interpretation is not limited to textual data and moreover, my interpretation is not merely analysis of text (MacKein, 2010). Although some of the data
did come from text, for example the brochure, data for this thesis came from multiple spaces (and performances) including observant participation (Thrift, 2000) which included “non-representational theory’s engagement with practices, embodiment and materiality” (Dewsbury, 2010, pg. 327). Important in this thesis was the engagement of the body with the material and non-material characteristics of the spaces of data collection. This was achieved through the interpretation of what Dewsbury (2010, pg. 327) calls the “nervous energies, amplitudes and thresholds”. In the empirical chapters I communicate my interpretation of data in a number of ways including through vignettes (see section 3.6.2 below for how I use vignettes as both data and analysis) as a form of storytelling (see MacKian, 2010) and the use of images and excerpts from fieldwork notes as well as from the tour brochure.

Latham (2003, pg. 1993) suggests the performative turn in geography (see chapter one for a discussion of my performative approach in this thesis) encourages “a more experimental and more flexible attitude towards both the production and interpretation of research evidence”. Thus for me, good analysis is as Silverman (2005, pg. 327) notes, “both rigorous and flexible: it is guided by a healthy mix of ‘analytic inspiration’ and empiricism written for and directed at a particular audience”. In the following discussion I turn to the practicalities and discuss how I interpreted and analysed my data. Given that data was gathered in different ways I will deal with my analysis of data types separately. However, prior to doing so I want to discuss how I came to manage and organise my data in a way that allowed it to be analysed and interpreted.

It is important to remember, “themes are abstract (and often fuzzy) constructs that investigators identity before, during, and after data collection” (Ryan and Bernard, 2003, pg. 780). Not only did themes come from my own experiences but also emerging themes were influenced by my theoretical orientation, the richness of existing literature and those characteristics of the phenomenon under study. Engagement with the literature also enabled me to think about the relations between the data and meaning and how
these might fit within, or indeed mediate, emergent themes. Importantly then, I did not perform a formal thematic analysis of the data; as Willig (2013) argues, looking for themes is part of many different approaches to analysis and interpretation – and the theme still requires interpretation. Themes then emerged through my ongoing reflection on each day's activities along with reading and re-reading the data on my return from fieldwork. As themes emerged from the data I also engaged in an active, continuous and conscious identification of other themes (and refinement of emergent themes) through (re)reading notes and critical engagement with the literature.

Dominant themes that emerged during the fieldwork were associated with everyday life. These included the temporal patterns and rhythms of daily life along with the performances and encounters that were embedded in these patterns. When engaging with the data (both during and post fieldwork) I began to focus in on data that highlighted daily life on tour. Key themes that emerged also allowed me a way to develop a framework for the empirical chapters in the thesis. Thus I introduce my interpretation of the brochure as a space where the tourist imaginary is preconfigured, through the construction of community and to how we performed everyday life as we progressed through the trip.

I deal at length in chapter four with the brochure as a source of data. As such I want here to deal with the practicalities of my analysis of the brochure as a document. I would point out here that in the initial stages of the thesis I did not think of the brochure as a source of data. Rather it was a means to an end - I made use of it in similar ways to other potential tourists (Rozier-Rich and Santos, 2011, Selwyn, 1996, Molina and Esteban, 2006). In the course of planning field work and attempting to obtain access to a group tour I looked through brochures from four tour companies, however at that point my focus was on price and inclusions rather than any meaning making I could draw from them. It was not until I was in the field and became part of the discussion around what we had seen during the day that had been highlighted in the brochure (Jenkins, 2003, see
chapter four for the role of brochures as circuits of representation), that I became attuned to the possibilities of the brochure as a useful source of data.

I came to understand the brochure as a vehicle that I (and others) might use to understand tourism as a social practice and in particular its role in constructing the imaginary. As such I needed to think about how I might analyse the brochure by carrying out a “close reading of the document [itself] and the ways in which it was authored, produced, used and consumed” (Coffey, 2013, pg. 17). That is, not only did I read and re-read the brochure but paid close attention to which meaning was both made and consumed. Moreover, I needed to think about how I could include interpretation of the brochure as a site of action and encounter during the planning stage as a particular social setting. Important in the context of this thesis is that the brochure, as a document, was analysed in the context of its use as an everyday object (see chapter four where I discuss the brochure as an item of everyday use). In effect I needed to find a way to study the production and consumption of the brochure and rather than data mining (for example through content analysis), look for analytical approaches that recognise documents themselves as ways in which social actors make sense of social worlds (Coffey, 2013).

Given the emphasis of my themes, my analysis of the brochure focused on looking at how everyday life played out through observations in the field were constructed and mediated through the brochure. Thus, what was initially of interest were images and text that represented everyday life. At this point my focus was on interpretive analysis - what type of reality was the brochure constructing; how did the brochure accomplish this and importantly what was the brochure doing?

Much of my understanding of the brochure came from what might be considered a social semiotic analysis (Iedma, 2001). It is important to understand here that social semiotics allowed me to engage with the brochure in a way that focused my attention on the symbolic relations mediated through the images and texts (important also from the
perspective of my position as symbolic interactionist). Thus in chapter four I talk of how eating away from home and in ‘strange’ places was mediated through the gendered and ethnic arrangements of staff shown in particular images. Social semiotics therefore provided me a way to ask questions of the brochure as a representational resource. For instance, to look at how the (tour) organisation constructed what might be considered types of rules that in the imaginary at least, preconfigured habits and routines and so, symbolically structuring our daily lives (Jewitt and Oyama, 2001).

A significant source of data came from ethnographic observations and (embodied) participation in the community; things I heard, saw or felt in the field. As such I now want to discuss how I went about carrying out ethnographic analysis. Important here is the notion of description as analysis. As Marvasti (2013) argues, the easiest way to (re)present observations is to write them down. As such my journals and other written notes that I consider as data comprised observations and verbal accounts of my daily life on tour.

By including the full event drawn from my field notes, as it happened (Laurier and Philo, 2006), my discussion within the thesis provides evidence of my interpretation of ethnographic data (MacKian, 2010). Moreover, in presenting description through the inclusion of field notes in various forms, including vignettes (see section XXX where I discuss vignettes in detail), and excerpts from journals, I am engaging in descriptive analysis of my observations “with its emphasis on a realistic description of the field” (Marvasti, 2013, pg. 361). To me the description of events is important as it seeks to place the reader within the field. However, like Marvasti (2013), I wanted to go further than merely presenting field notes as descriptive analysis and look at the overlaps between description (as analysis) and what might be seen as constructivist analysis. In doing so my analysis is not merely that of encounters and observations in the field, but also engagement with the observations themselves (for example vignettes) as data. I therefore integrated the data with concepts and theories from the literature in order to
explore and discuss the meanings found in my encounters. Without losing sight of the fact that context (the tour or happenings on tour) is socially constructed, I was able to analyse the social construction of the daily life I described (Holstein and Gubrium, 2003). As such I was merging empathetic interpretation where I was part of the phenomenon and wanted to elaborate on meaning, with that of a more ‘suspicious’ interpretation where I wanted to get below the surface and search for any latent meaning (Willig, 2013). By merging my interpretive stance I was attending to what Ricoeur (1996, pg. 154) suggests as the necessary engagement with interpretations as a “dialectic of understanding and explanation”.

3.6.1 Data
I want to clarify what I regard as data to be analysed and written up. In this thesis I use the idea of reflections from meetings as a way of producing the narrative. These are sections where I explicitly reflect on my position within the research and contextualise these within the specific frame under analysis. I use my journals as a form of data in their own right (Lyon and Busfield, 1996). Within the heritage of (realist) ethnography, as method, there was implicit recognition that the private reflections of the researcher remain distinct from the analysis and writing up of data on the subject(s) of the research. However, this is to suggest something of a disjuncture between what might be considered as valid to write ‘down’ and what is used in writing ‘up’ the research (Emerson et al., 1995). This can be recognised, for example, in the debate surrounding the publication of Malinowski’s field diaries and subsequent challenges to the legitimacy of his work. In this thesis, I analyse and write my emotions, personal concerns and thoughts not only from the field (Punch, 2010), but also personal journal entries from periods prior to the research as well as notes written during the process of the thesis (Hammersley, 1997). Through these personal ‘disruptions’ I wanted to write in a way that encouraged a transparent reflexivity (Punch, 2010). By juxtaposing (my) internal

17 This is central to the realisation of a ‘reflexive’ ethnography. See chapter two.
dialogue with dialogic encounters and interactions with others as well as material culture I was able to foreground the multiple spaces of the everyday on tour, for example the supposed stillness within the mobile coach.

3.6.2 Making use of vignettes

Vignettes, it is suggested, offer an alternative to representation and in addition attend to reflexivity (Humphreys, 2005). Moreover, they are often used in the “vivid portrayal of the conduct of an event of everyday life” (Erickson, 1986, p.149). Whilst vignettes may be used as a research method (Grønhøj and Bech-Larsen, 2010), in this thesis I use them as a means to communicate (and subsequently an analysis of) data to the reader. They are normally temporally bound, focused on a limited number of agents, and within a particular space, or utilise a combination of the three (Miles and Huberman, 1994). I use vignettes to “introduce characters, foreshadow events and analyses to come, highlight particular findings, or summarise a particular theme or issue in analysis or interpretation” and in doing so “encapsulate what the researcher finds through fieldwork” (Ely, 1997, p. 70-71). As such, I use vignettes to present vivid, contextually rich account of particular events.

In operationalising vignettes there are two core activities, the writing up of the vignette and its analysis and interpretation. In chapters five to seven I (co)produce two types of vignettes. In the first, I present what might be regarded as an impressionist tale, where I draw on pieces of text, moments of performance, and bits of conversation from particular events that are pulled together to given an impression of the event (Montgomery, 2007). In other instances, the vignette itself is pulled directly from a data source in one chunk. In both cases the vignettes are subsequently analysed and interpreted. In the process of producing the vignettes I was aware of Ely’s (1997) assertion that vignettes demand attention. Without doubt, when developing and analysing vignettes, I developed a deeper understanding of the meaning of my research.
3.6.3 Using images

I have been acutely aware that my role as researcher, my gender and age, how I composed the photograph, what I excluded along with the roles played by others informed the construction and use of my images (Pink, 2007). Moreover, these images must be considered fluid in their representations; their meanings will always be multiple and often changing for both those and myself concerned in the construction and interpretation of the photograph (Pink, 2012a).

I have used photographs in the text in a number of ways; as a memory aide to situate locations, people, spaces and performance (Knowles and Sweetman, 2004); as well as a primary source of data (Stanczak, 2007). Many of the images I took were photographed and analysed from a reflexive position. During the process of writing up, I found that my role as a tourist had been played out from a realist standpoint – where many of my photographs were taken mindlessly (see chapter seven).

Of importance in this context is not just the use of certain technology, for example the camera as a way of capturing data within the field, but also to me, placement of the visual within the thesis itself (Crang, 2010). Therefore, where I use images as an aide memoir, they remind me of, and so link the reader to, encounters and interactions. In this way they are situated within the text in an unambiguous way with appropriate labelling that associates them directly with the relevant text.

In those sections where I use images as data to be analysed I situate the photographs as a kind of montage stand alone, almost as a side bar to the (written) text, where my aim is to “create ethnographic representations that capture the multilinearity of ethnographic research and everyday lives” (Pink, 2007, p. 143). As such, the image itself becomes representational, it acts in concert with the written text and is not necessarily directly referred to in the text in the same way as the image(s) as aide memoir. Finally, I also use visual data to represent particular themes within the thesis. I do so by using images that
capture specific contexts, relationships within the group, and material and human encounters (Hamilton and Pinnegar, 2009). This allows me another way to communicate and make visible particular themes and give context to the reader. Thus the visual images used within the thesis “interact with, cross-reference and produce meaning in relation to other elements” (Pink, 2007, p. 167).

By using images in multiple ways I attend to the call by Crang (2010, pg. 361) for more attention to the tensions inherent in “the intersection of gazes; and this intersection of gazes between the tourist, the observer, the observed and the later viewers of any pictures”. I was able use many of these images to (re)analyse more than visible phenomenon, and also as Stoller (1997) suggests, actively engage in sensuous scholarship, attending to taste, smell and other sensualities encountered in interactions.

Whilst photographs taken by myself and other group members form a corpus of visual data, images from other sources were also utilised. Here I refer to images collected from those unattended spaces of tourism (Haldrup and Larsen, 2009), for example the tour brochure (see chapter four), where the depictions of the performance of tourism have become somewhat ubiquitous and in themselves are thought of as banal (Waterton, 2011). As an alternative to images that offer representations of the destination and the exotic nature of tourism (see for example Molina and Esteban, 2006, Jenkins, 2003), I use images drawn from the brochure that attend to and represent an imagined everyday life of the individual on tour.

3.7 Ethics

Until this point in the thesis my dialogic self has been somewhat silenced by the performance of the writing (voicing) of a less-than-social discourse. My discussion has, in the main, followed an institutional directive - where my student self has acted to subordinate other (possibly agential) roles to produce the beginnings of what I hope is a
meaningful narrative (Hermans and Dimaggio, 2004). However, the fact that I am writing (have written the previous sentence) in this way is suggestive of the interplay between the 'I' and the 'Me' of interactionism (Mead and Morris, 1934). Here I refer to the tensions inherent in the self; the “impulsive and creative impulses” of the 'I' against the “socialised internalisation of social mores” by the ‘Me’ (Atkinson and Housley, 2003, p. 7). This is important, as it is a reflexive process (Reynolds and Herman-Kinney, 2003, 1990). The ‘I’ and the ‘Me’ are therefore conjoint – they coexist in time and space (Atkinson and Housley, 2003’). As Lynch (2000, pg. 26) asserts, reflexivity is “not [only] an epistemological, moral or political virtue”. In addition to the challenge for me to be more fully conscious of the ideology, culture, and politics of those I studied and those who might be my audience, reflexivity came to permeate every aspect of the research, including my choice of methods and the resultant ethical concerns.

Of course, ethical guidelines are, at an institutional level, concerned with the research(ers) performance of dutiful ethics (Etherington, 2007); fairness, privacy and duty of care amongst others. In certain fields of inquiry contemporary understandings of ethics go beyond ‘procedural’ ethics. This is to politicise how we understand ethics in the construction of meaning and knowledge to include issues such as power and identity in the collection data and its subsequent representation as 'knowledge'; as an ethics of practice (Guillemin and Gillam, 2004).

I however, as have many before me, worried about how an ethics of research practice, or more accurately ethics stipulated by the institution within which I was conducting this fieldwork, might operate to serve institutional interests rather than the interests of the research participants and myself (Cheek, 2007). In reflecting on these processes and my own mind-set when seeking institutional ethics, I needed to ask myself if I would be bringing into existence that which I was trying to avoid, namely passenger discomfort.
Not only passenger discomfort was involved but also a kind of discomfort to the researcher self. Whilst I felt some sense of emotional turmoil, which clearly showed in my dealings with those around me, I ended up dealing with ethics rather pragmatically as it was essential for funding purposes. However, it did encourage me to think about how I might invoke ethics in the practice of writing and thinking reflexively. I would not be admitting to simply thinking of ethics only in its form-filling role.

3.7.1 Accessing the tourist

Being able to access tourists is an issue that dominates the discourses on tourist behaviour (Harrison, 2003). Thus when I began (consciously) thinking about the ethics surrounding the research process, and in particular meetings and encounters, at the forefront of my thoughts was how I would develop and maintain long-term relationships of trust throughout the process.

There are multiple issues inherent in studying identity practices when the individual is performing tourism, and a number of these have resulted in challenges to ethnographic research in the field. However, I needed to remember, “while initially seeming tricky, [this research] is imperative if we want to meaningfully expand our understanding of the tourist experience” (Frohlick and Harrison, 2008, pg. 5). Thus, before entering the FIGT I toiled with the thought that disclosing myself as a researcher would put into jeopardy and disrupt my fellow passenger performance of their tourist selves.

During my engagement with the methods literature I found much of the discussion surrounding distance, the participant – observer dichotomy in effect (and affect), somewhat ambiguous (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2002). This was, at least initially, problematic as I thought about how I would be researching and living in a space I had, in a previous life, called home (the hotel). Moreover, the only time I would not be observing and participating would be when I was sleeping. Likewise the literature did not really allow me to come to terms with (or imagine) how I might cope with the people with
whom I would be in close proximity to and share intimacies with, or the performance of everyday activities over an extended period of time. What was equally important was the consideration that I, as a social actor, would be implicated in the construction and performance of daily life on tour and thus the data to be collected. If I was to be implicated in the construction of data, what were the ethical ramifications?

3.7.2 Practicalities

In engaging in analytic auto-ethnography, my participation also necessitated recording interactions between myself and other members of the FIGT. Of course, as I have stated elsewhere, the company requested I keep disruption to a minimum (and see Harrison, 2011), and so, before fieldwork, I contemplated whether this would necessitate covert research. However, pragmatically I had planned to approach participants and undertake the research overtly. As such, and as part of the ethics process, I had prepared information sheets and consent forms for potential participants of the research (see Appendix One). In making my preparations for fieldwork, and in order to adhere to the company’s directive to not disrupt other tour members, I remained attuned to the possibility of employing covert research (and read widely on the positives and negatives of such research). By going into the field with an element of flexibility, I was able to recognise opportunities where I might ‘announce’ my intentions without disrupting the mobilities of the tour or, importantly, disrupting my positioning as both researcher and subject.

As I discus in Chapter Five (see 5.8.3), at the first stop I remained on board the coach in order to mark assignments. Not only did this subsequently become data, but it also became an opportune moment to share my intentions as researcher. The interest by other tour members as to what I was doing and why, became an integral part of my entry, along with others, into the community. We were, all of us, affectively co-constructing community by sharing stories. This period allowed me to interact in a semi-formal manner in order to gain informed consent; to use photographs and make use of
our goings-on as data within the thesis. Declaring my intentions also resulted in a number of the community sending me images of their own to use as data or to incorporate in the thesis, as I wanted. Many of these gave added insight into my positioning as researcher/tourist as they captured ‘moments’ of action in my day to day life as a tourist that I could not have captured myself (I discuss my progress into the group and interactions with others at length in Chapters Five and Seven).

3.7.3 Method(ology) and the practice of ethics
As Law and Urry (Law and Urry, pg. 404) point out, I needed to remind myself of the choices I was making in preparation for ‘meeting’ by understanding that;

If methods are not innocent then they are also political. They help to make realities. But the question is: which realities? Which do we want to help make more real, and which less real?

The question was; did I need to be an outsider to observe? Of course a central tenet of interactionism is that ‘observation’ is prior to action. In my daily life I am always observing, attempting to make sense of social order and how I am/not part of the social fabric of the spaces around me. What I want to make clear here is that meaning is given to my life through shared (social) practices and materiality; my being-in-the-world is made sense of through my existence in it – rather than being detached from it (Heidegger, 1962).

One of the reasons I found reflexive ethnography interesting was that it allowed me to deal (personally) with issues of researcher authority. After all, what right did I have to speak for the (touring) subject? Central to my thinking was the question of whose voice should be privileged in the research. As important, whose voice would be silenced as I was writing down and writing up the research? Engaging with reflexive ethnography
became a way (strategy) of acknowledging and dealing with the moral (metaphysical) dilemma I faced in my attempt to know the subject (and in turn being a knowing subject).

In reflexive ethnography the issue of ethics is complex. Often it is difficult to maintain the anonymity of respondents as they may be(come) close to the researcher (Hall, 2009). Less obvious however is the ethics towards ones 'self' as researcher. Not only the 'I' invoked in the representational politics of writing reflexive ethnography (Pollock, 2007a), but also an ethics towards the self as subject - towards protecting our selves.

3.7.4 Disclosing and performing contested 'selves'
My own touristic performances changed as a result of both research practice and my needing to be a part of the community. I found it somewhat ironic that here I was, as a researcher and a tourist, performing tourism and taking part in activities I had never previously done - and in fact had actively resisted. For instance, for me, unpacking is something that makes me feel uncomfortable - it is inherently about immobility and mooring. Likewise not being able to wear what I felt was the uniform of the FIGT tourist (please see chapter seven) meant that I had to adapt my tourist/research persona (the affective planning went out the window).

There are, of course, multiple ways in which ethics came to the fore in fieldwork. In hindsight, something as simple as staging a photograph had unforeseen consequences. Images captured during the fieldwork are a form of representation, of people, places, things as well as 'events'. Naturally then, one must consider the ethics involved in taking (and capturing) images. Historically, photographic images were viewed as an objective truth, a representation of an actual event. Contemporary technologies now blur the line between photography as representation of events and photography as 'art' where, post hoc, images are adulterated for artistic (or other) motives. I had thought about the use of photography when undertaking my institutional ethics prior to fieldwork. Should I, for
example, limit my photography to ‘things’ rather than people? However, the reality of research in the field encouraged me to think about a wider ethics of performance. Rather than merely the ethics of what I captured, it became about how I staged or created events as data. As I have discussed in the previous chapter, photography is a ubiquitous tourist performance. I have never owned a camera (the cameras I used were provided by my institution). In my previous travels I had never taken photographs; but on the FIGT needing to capture images as research data and also as part of the integral performance of the tourist became important.

Another challenge that impacted on my ability to perform as a tourist, and as part of the community was financial. Of course access to funding for research is a common problem. Not merely for those conducting fieldwork, but equally for those engaged in wider academic research. I had received funding for airfares to get me to the field and a substantial amount towards the trip itself. One of the more pragmatic reasons for choosing this particular tour was that it included breakfasts and most dinners in the price. However lunches, an important space and performance for interacting with the wider community (commensality) of the coach were not. I thus found myself attempting to perform a lifestyle I could not afford. I felt I had to do this in order to be part of the community. Whilst on the surface this might appear a somewhat benign example of an ethical issue - it impacted significantly on how I performed identity and thus engaged with others (and the subsequent meanings that were taken from those encounters). For example, a trip to a fast food restaurant during one lunch break (please see chapter six) was in itself a form of rationalisation of my not performing with the community. I did not have enough money to eat with the others so ate fast-food instead. Whilst mundane, this impacted on both my performance as researcher and tourist, as well as the knowledge I was co-constructing.
3.7.5 Excluding others

On looking through my journals I noted that I had made frequent comments about how others in the community had commented on who else in the group was talking to me (and indeed drinking with me), and how a number of these people seemed ‘distant’ to those who made these comments to me.

Plate 3.5 Breaking ranks – drinking with the tour director

It is in my nature, and especially given my previous career choices to, or at least attempt to, engage with all those around me. Still (as I discuss further in chapter seven), this had clearly placed me outside what others perceived as the normal behaviour of those in the community. Of course there are encounters in any community that can be troublesome, we tire of each other, interests diverge. However, my conversing with all, especially those perceived as socially on the periphery of the group, was noticed. That I was also performing as a researcher, to me, highlighted this tension. For me it was normal
behaviour, to others it was noticeably different. As asked at one comfort stop..."How come they (Steven and Beryl) talk to you and no-one else"? Thus choosing whom to talk or not talk to is itself subject to an ethics of community.

Others reaction to this situation as well as the perceptions of my relationship with the tour director (including other’s representations of this at a later stage, see chapter seven) made me question my performance of self. I often found myself wondering if I should be engaging so much with the tour director in a social sense. None of the others did, and in fact it became something that was discussed by others in the group; ‘why is he (tour director) asking questions’, why is he buying you drinks?’ (see plate 3.4). Was I researcher? A fellow community member? Should I change who I am to fit in and conform to what I felt the others expected of me? The questions I was asking myself were to a large extent informed by my need to obtain what I thought, at the time, was data; both from the wider group but also from those others to whom I had been talking. However, in reflecting on these encounters, I felt that I was (sometimes) abandoning some in favour of others (Gemignani, 2011).

3.7.6 Including others

Whilst I shared intimate stories with individuals in the group, my knowledge of them, as well as others around me, could only ever be fragmented and partial (Taylor, 2011). Given our close proximity, empathetic relations and friendships were developed (and are maintained). These in turn shaped identity (and performance and data) both in the field and on my return home (Coffey, 1999). It is important that I acknowledge this as these relations had a fundamental impact not only on encounters and my understanding of what was happening around me (data) but also in who was collecting data.

Co-constructing the coach as a form of mobile dwelling (at least for the majority of the day) naturally created opportunities for the blurring of 'boundaries' and the creation of spatially and temporally bound relationships and intimacies. As a result of proximity, my
relations with others around me transcended the space of both tourism and the academy (Cann and DeMeulenaere, 2012). Conversations with Vera (who sat next to me throughout the trip) and others wound between what we were experiencing as tourists, what I was doing as a researcher and my and others lives outside of the tour. As a result many of those around me became co-researchers, and thus complicit in the research itself (Altrichter and Holly, 2005, Payne, 1996 and please see chapter seven ). As such, there was a blurring of identity practices, where others performances and representations acted to illustrate my own vacillation between researcher and tourist. Furthermore, and as a consequence of my own research, it resulted in these individuals themselves (reflexively) performing as researchers as well as tourists. For example, subsequent to the tour and without prompting, I was emailed images by a number of my fellow group members that illustrated the tensions inherent in performing tourist/researcher identities (of both myself, but equally those whom took the photographs). Some took images of me being the researcher (see plate 7.3), others took images of me being a tourist, whilst some took photographs of me performing everyday life. Vera, as seen in plate 3.5, took a photograph of me conversing with the tour director - in actuality showing me acting outside of the community, breaking ranks if you will as I have discussed above.

3.8 Summary

My focus in this chapter has been to highlight the ways in which I have collected data and importantly, to highlight where in the process of research I understand data to be available. Thus, the period of data collection (and indeed data) is not limited to the fieldwork, or in meetings but is also to be found in the past history of the researcher, the processes of research itself, in the methods engaged and indeed, in thinking into the future. I wanted to make clear that the field site and meetings were constructed rather than discovered. They were not traditionally bounded and disconnected from my
everyday life; rather they were unbounded and interconnected with both my daily life as well as those others with whom, through the passage of the research, I co-constructed space, time and shared stories.

In the following chapter my attention turns to understanding the role of the tourist brochure in constructing the tourist imaginary and in particular its concerns with the banal activities and practices of everyday life that we necessarily take on tour with us.
Chapter Four: **Constructing the imaginary**

### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with particular materialities and spaces that worked to both preconfigure and frame the mobilities of individuals’ everyday lives on tour. It was these materialities that mediated and were in turn crucial to the performance and realities of (corporeal and other) mobility, both by the individual and the group as a bound community (see chapter 5 for further discussion of the group as community). My particular focus in this chapter is the seemingly immobile space of the tourist brochure and how it, through the use of imagination, is implicated in the mediation and subsequent realisation of the tourists’ daily life. Of particular interest for me was the apparent paradox of the brochure. Whilst representing the ‘exotic’ along with the promises of ‘escape’ it is, as material culture, somewhat mundane. As such, I explore the construction and configuration of the tourist imaginary, mediated through the engagement and performance of material culture. More specifically I locate the tourist brochure as a cultural praxis of modern daily life.

In the previous three chapters I have introduced my epistemological (and methodological) position as well as giving context to this thesis through a discussion of everyday life and tourism. In this chapter I begin to engage with empirical data in order to explore the ramifications of the positioning of tourism as supposed antithesis of everyday life and identity at ‘home’.

Of particular interest to me was how the brochure became, for example, performative space(s), where it worked in, as well as on, the borderlands of identity performance. Such spaces included the brochure as a performance to be negotiated in the process of assembling the tourist. Therefore, rather than immediately moving beyond the banal and
habitual (Crouch, 2003), to the practical realities of the group on tour, I want to deconstruct what I will argue as the everyday performances of reading the tour brochure. I have done so, in part, to understand the performative possibilities of my own everyday life prior to meetings, as both researcher-self, and prior to corporeal travel as tourist-self. Here I am particularly interested in Lahire’s (2011) notion of the plural actor. As such, I am not simply a researcher, but simultaneously a partner, worker and future (and present and past) tourist. In acknowledging such possibilities my interest and attention became drawn to the (dis)entanglements of the emergent self, the becoming of the tourist if you will. Thus I sought to engage reflexively with those performances that actively (re)constituted my multiple and (often) contested self, and moreover, that informed and were in turn informed by my everyday life on the way to undertaking field work for this thesis.

Every journey, both figurative and literal, begins with some form of mobility. To me, it is the temporal nature of the mobilisation of identity performances that provides context for this chapter. However rather than linear time, where becoming seems to appear as “discrete instants” or as “projected frozen” moments (Kwinter, 2001, pg. 4), I view and think of becoming, or more specifically, of my becoming as an event-moment, fundamentally as an ‘unfolding’ of temporal opportunities (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, Marcus and Saka, 2006, Doel, 1999). The knowledge(s) I sought were both entangled throughout and embedded deeply within my everyday life. It was important for me therefore, to analyse and understand the influence of specific everyday experiences that had had a part to play in the (pre)configuration of both meetings, and as importantly, in my multiple and contested (and conflicted) identities on tour.

When reflecting upon and thinking about the mundane and banal performances that took place prior to and during my entry to the actual tour, I began to realise that I had needed to engage dialogically and moreover reflexively with multiple (and often contested) selves. This was, in no small part, achieved through engagement with the
often-overlooked details of planning; making choices (or not) of where to go or what to pack made (or not made) and those other processes that acted to inform the assembly of my tourist/researcher self (and of course subsequent construction of knowledge). These reflections led me to focus upon and interpret particular spaces and moments that, in turn, have influenced me the most on the thesis journey.

Thinking about my daily performances leading up to fieldwork, one particular performance stood out; (what became) the mundane and banal practice of (re)reading holiday brochures and looking at associated websites. Of course, from a motivation perspective, one could suggest the construction of the tourist self is the tourist brochure (although this is to essentialise the tourist). Whilst acknowledging this possibility, my focus here is to engage with specific (social) performances involved in the construction of the tourist imaginary. Thus, in the first part of the chapter I situate the tourist brochure as a specific (performed) space, used as a vector of enquiry. In the second part of the discussion my focus becomes the materiality and performance of the brochure, for example the haptic qualities alongside the more prosaic aspects of the brochure such reading and planning – the brochure’s functional qualities if you will. My objective here is to demythologise the brochure as existing primarily as a conveyer of the exotic by thinking and (re)reading the brochure as a spatial dialectic. I therefore argue for the tourist brochure as an ideological and representational space. In doing this, I seek to highlight how the brochure acts as a social and cultural text that works (performatively) to not only communicate the exotic but more importantly here, to (pre)configure an imagined everyday life on tour.

One area of interest to me was the representations of what might be considered the banal and mundane. This includes, for example, representations of the performances of eating and sleeping and the role such representations might play in the (pre)construction of the tour group as a social imaginary. To achieve this I explore those textual (and affective) representations of the coalescence of home and away that
encouraged me to pre-configure an (imagined) everyday life-on-the-road, but to also begin the process of constructing the tour group as an imaginary within which my touring self might makes sense of daily life away from ‘home’. In the final part of my discussion I pull together these ideas and readings and engage with a range of literatures to theorise these readings.

4.2 Why the tourist brochure

Often it seems as if our attempts to understand the performance(s) of becoming the tourist is overlooked in the rush to attend to understanding the practice(s) of being the tourist. It appears, almost as if in some mystical way, that as one travels away from home one undergoes an unproblematic metamorphosis and achieves the status of tourist. Certainly the search for knowledge and understanding of the roles and performances social actors enact as tourists is critical to developing an understanding of tourist identity. There is, however, a lacuna of knowledge in the role of the imaginary in the (pre)configuration of (tourist) identity. More specifically I suggest, in the relationship between the imaginary and the realities of tourist praxis – the ‘doing’ of tourism. The brochure is of particular interest to me as it facilitates the exploration of how particular spatial and embodied experiences of the everyday at ‘home’, or prior to corporeal travel, work to (pre)configure the idea of the tourist through a tourism imaginary.

The brochure, as a creative form, might be considered a somewhat mundane medium (Atton, 2001). After all, the primary purpose of the brochure is its day-to-day functionality in communicating a product offering: the mediation of a promise rather than the realities of tourist performance(s) in-situ. To me, it is in thinking of the brochure as something that many of us engage with in our everyday lives at home, the hidden and thus overlooked possibilities that are interesting. Moreover, it is the ambiguity of the brochure that appeals to me. It is part of everyday contemporary consumer life; offering representations of those exotic possibilities afforded by travel and furthering
institutional mythmaking (McKercher and Prideaux, 2014), whilst simultaneously a part and parcel of the routines of planning, for example, the annual holiday (Binnie et al., 2007).

The brochure is an integral part of what might be considered performances of home, for example armchair tourism (Strain, 2003), or kitchen table tourism (Bell and Hollows, 2007a), in the same vein as televised travel programmes and lifestyle magazines. Although, as Urry and Larsen (2011 after Feifer, 1985) suggest, the brochure works on a functional level to stimulate demand for travel, it also offers potential for the banalisation of tourism as one need not “leave his or her house in order to see many of the typical objects of the tourist gaze” (pg. 113). Of course the brochure works, psychologically, to stimulate desire. However it is its social performance as everyday (affective) materiality that is of concern here.

Thus for me, the brochure, like the UK’s BBC 1 Holiday show, meets the needs of lifestyle practices of many people in late modernity (Dunn, 2007, Jaworski et al., 2003), as well as playing a role in the fantasies of planning future travel (Bell and Hollows, 2007b, Dann, 2003). However, I want to problematize this latter view by (re)thinking and analysing the tour brochure through Lefebvre’s (1991) spatial dialectics.

4.2.1 Spatialities of the brochure

When the brochure is considered as a socio-spatial practice in everyday life it can be situated as lived and experienced space. Of particular importance is understanding how the spatial and performative characteristics of the brochure work to construct alternate spaces (Jansson and Lagerkvist, 2009) that then problematise binaries such as home and away (as well as tourist – other). In achieving this, the brochure challenges our perceived ‘realities’ of being in the world. The brochure can thus be thought of as working on and with the imagination, offering the possibility for multiple realities. For example, a potential of an imagined exotic exists alongside the tour brochures mundane, utilitarian
performance as marketing collateral. In order to understand the everyday world of the tourist we need, as Crouch (2007) urges, to understand the tourist-in-becoming by making use of “[t]he meaning of spaces that tourists identify” and understand how being the tourist “can be tracked back through diverse and multiple influences, including brochures” (Crouch, pg. 59).

However, in order to do so I needed to demythologise the tourist brochure. As such I came to understand how one might think about tourism as a social imaginary, a space where everyday life has the potential to be both known and unknown. In making use of the imagination and representations of the mundane and banal, I was able to problematise tourism as primarily an exotic outcome. In saying that, representations mediated by the tourist brochure are fundamental to understanding, and form the basis of, particular tourist imaginaries (Gravari-Barbas and Graburn, 2012). Certainly for me, as both researcher and group member, it was such representations (and the brochure as lived space) that mediated my experiences of ‘home’ and against which I made judgement and reflected upon the reality (or otherwise) of my performances of everyday life ‘away from home’, whilst on tour.

Given these possibilities, I was encouraged to use the tourist brochure to look at both local scale realities (mundane activities of daily life) and large-scale structures (ideology). The brochure (re)presented a way for me to understand myself and (future) group members by thinking about and analysing the production and consumption of touristic representations. However, if I am to think of the brochure as a socio-spatiality, then it was important, as Ploger (2001) would argue, that I understood the importance of the representations offered through, and by the spatialities of, the brochure by engaging in in-depth readings of them. In saying that, my interest was not merely in the text but in the sensory encounters with both text and materiality of the brochure – those embodied and affective interactions. My analysis then includes my interpretation of the brochure as a performance space.
In deciding how to make best use of the brochure in understanding specific everyday practices that might be performed by the tourist, I engaged with imaginative geographies (Larsen, 2006a). Such thinking enabled me to work through and consider the ways the brochure might work as a kind of third space (Routledge, 1996, Scarles, 2004) – as a space of potential. Thus, rather than situating the brochure as primarily mediating the tourist/other binary, I could begin to argue for the brochure as a space of becoming where the brochure not only (pre)configures, but also re-configures the plural actor (Lahire, 2011).

4.2.2 Reading the brochure

I began my analysis of the brochure by disrupting the circulation of meaning. Not only does the tourist brochure re-present and represent the exotic through written text and images, but also the tourist brochure itself, as material culture, can be equally regarded as something that represents itself as the exotic possibility of escape (Stevens and MacLaran, 2005). Moreover, in troubling the brochure as a symbolic space I was able to critically engage with and analyse my own encounters, readings and subsequent interpretations gained throughout the process of planning and booking the tour. These encounters arose from the ‘work’ involved in planning the tour as both holiday and research in the field. These ideas and readings were written down prior to my engagement with others on tour and were supplemented by repeating the process on my return ‘home’. In reading and re-reading the brochure I was corresponding to the claim that brochures play as an important role after the trip as they do beforehand in planning the trip (Urry, 1990). The brochure provided opportunity for both anticipation and memory (Cartier and Lew, 2005).

I was thus able to engage with the brochure as a materiality not only prior to, but also left over from my trip away/field work. As such I could explore how it worked, on reflection, to (re)construct my understanding of fieldwork (Burns, 2004). However, to me, rather than the brochure being merely a material object “whose significance is less
[its] formal qualities than [its] numinous relationship with a distant place and memorable experiences” (Franklin and Crang, 2001, pgs. 15/16), I came to understand the brochure more as a social object. Furthermore, rather than just producer or reader agency (Croteau et al., 2012), the brochure itself, as material culture, has agency; it shapes social life (González-Ruibal, 2012). Whilst situated in the here and now, it was active in my becoming the tourist and nascent researcher.

I could simultaneously read, feel, touch and even smell the brochure. As such, as both the tourist and researcher, my interpretations were somewhat conflicted. On the one hand, in imagining my tourist self, I wanted the exotic possibilities promised to me by the images and texts. On the other hand, and as an active researcher, I wanted to question what it all meant. In this context, what was important to me was to allow these multiple readings to be (re)presented in this thesis. In order to do so, the following section has, as its focus, locating the brochure. My aim here is to discuss the brochure in the context of space.

4.3 The brochure as discursive construction

There is a substantial literature focused on the tourist brochure (Lester and Scarles, 2014, Buck, 1977, Jenkins, 2003, Selwyn, 1990a, Wang, 2006, Pritchard, 2000). However my aim here is not to produce an extensive literature review of that work as this can be found elsewhere (Francesconi, 2011, Molina and Esteban, 2006). Rather my focus in this section is to give particular context from which I can then embark upon my analysis of the intersection between the everyday life and the brochure.

The tourist brochure, as a material reality, can be regarded as a kind of imagetext (Mitchell, 1987) where the brochure can be thought of as a complex and dynamic medium combining both visual images and text. The discourse mediated through the text and images (and language) of the tourist brochure appears, on first glance, to primarily
centre on the construction and communication of representations that seek to place the recipient outside of their everyday life (see e.g. Ateljevic, 2000, Britton, 1991). As such the brochure is implicated in the on-going (re)construction of a number of tourism myths (Selwyn, 1990b, Selwyn, 1996), including that of the escape from the mundaneness of everyday life. As a consequence, the brochure is often located as marketing collateral (Andereck, 2005), with its main function being the transmission of positive (and attractive) images of the destination to be visited. Thus the brochure uses images and text to encourage and engage a particular discursive imagination (Sökefeld, 2006). As Urry and Larsen (2011, pg. 179) remind us, amongst other things “what is sought for in a holiday is a set of photographic images which has already been seen in the tour company brochure”. Here, it could be said, the brochure itself (discursively) completes the circle of representation (Jenkins, 2003).

The brochure, as Edensor (2001, pg. 71) argues, presents “pre-existing, discursive, practical embodied norms which help to guide [the tourist’s] performative orientations”. It is such discourse that is employed in order to ensure the tourist understands how to ‘be’ when faced with possible risks when performing ‘self’ in daily life away from ‘home’ (Edensor, 2001). In doing so, the brochure engages a dominant, if not hegemonic, discourse – that of a commodified everyday life (Bruner, 1991). The brochure, read at home (or even on return) acts as a representational space. At first, as representation of an everyday globalised ‘lifestyle’, the brochure works to (pre)socialise the individual and moreover ‘civilise’ the prospective tourist through the mediation of expected behaviour (Stampe, 2008). Through the brochure, to both the tourist and the toured, the mobile individual is represented “as a universalised, contained, rational, and self-knowing bundle of innate or pre-existing ‘preferences’” (Bowman, 2006, pg 103 see also, Johnston, 2001). Secondly, it is (re)presenting a particular ideological perspective of the everyday world (Harvey, 2000). If one is to think of tourism as discursively constructed, then to all intents and purposes the tourist brochure must be considered an institutional site. It is through such space(s) that the brochure works to (pre)configure an identity.
that fulfils a particular institutional requirement – for example, the ideology that situates the individual within a rationalised consumerist bubble (Ritzer, 1999, Weber, 1930/2001).

In the process of (pre)socialising the potential tourist, the brochure, as Bruner and Kirschblatt-Glimblett (1994) argue, removes individual agency and thus furthers the on-going narrative of home and away; the brochure overtly displays ‘otherness’ and the majority of images represent anywhere but home. However, what is important for me in considering the brochure as a representational space is to acknowledge that it produces (and reproduces) “discourses of space” whilst simultaneously itself being a “discourse in space” (Ploger, 2001, pg. 65). The entanglements of meaning within the brochure are made obvious when accepting it is not only tourist place(s) or destinations, but also community and daily life that are (pre)configured through the brochure.

4.3.1 The sensory brochure
The brochure is commonly considered as being performed and consumed visually. It is something that one picks up at the travel agent, takes back home and ‘reads’. However, that is to neglect other possible ways of understanding how the brochure functions. I include here, for example, the sensory nature of the brochure as material culture. The touch and feel, even the smell; those embodied characteristics of the brochure. Here one might also consider other sensory characteristics of the performance of the brochure – including for example, something as mundane as the turning of pages.

Whilst one can recognise and critique text and images, opportunities to understand materiality as a kind of ‘spectacle’ that can be brought into being through the other senses (Vannini, 2010) are largely overlooked. As such, to understand other meanings of, and in, the brochure it requires analysis as a material and non-material cultural text. The brochure is not a neutral space; it offers representations of both the real and imagined. As a media form that captures the imagination, the brochure “cannot remain
indifferent to space... It has been lived in... with all the partiality of the imagination” (Bachelard and Jolas, 1994, pg. xxvi, my italics). In a similar vein I, along with others on the tour, lived through the brochure.

4.4 Performing the brochure

I wanted to title this section performing the brochure as, rather than merely analysis, performing more aptly suggests a combined operationalization and analysis of the brochure. For me, it was key element in the “complex patina of practices” (Cartier and Lew, 2005, pg. 36), that worked in concert to (pre)configure my tourist/researcher-in-becoming. However, it was also closely aligned (and remains so) with my everyday life – where reading and interpreting the brochure became a normalised performance in my daily life. Where, for example, signing up to the organisation’s blog that formed part of the electronic brochure meant that receiving and reading (email) updates became mundane.

My practice of the brochure, that is, its instrumental use as a planning tool, followed, I am sure, the untold millions of other consumers, placing the brochure as ubiquitous media (Buck, 1977). From necessity, a primary concern was to find a suitable tour in which I could participate as a full member (see chapter two). Superficially, the brochure was a functional performance of my researcher self. On the other hand I was searching, as a tourist, for a suitable tour opportunity to meet people, something that is a common motivation for many individuals that undertake such package tours (Anderson et al., 2009). For many the brochure is a ritualised performance (Turner, 1977, Couldry, 2003), recognised by the organisation through the communication of benefits to regular consumers. That being said, individual readers’ engagement, interpretation and performance of tourist brochures are unique. Although there are commonalities, rather than looking for these I wanted to understand the nuances of the everyday performance(s) of the tourist brochure.
Giving emphasis to the brochure is an important part of my everyday life. How, for example, notations in margins and folded over pages brought back clear memories of my attempts to figure out where I would be on a particular day and if this or that particular hotel had WiFi, thus enabling me to contact home and continue to work (see chapters five and six). This was important as my memories and recollections (as data) are constructed not merely through the representation and discourse, carried through the language and images within the brochure, but also through my own (and others) inscriptions upon and the subsequent traces of events that remain on the materiality of the brochure.

Whilst the brochure is undoubtedly a form of mass communication, I was particularly interested in it as a form of interpersonal communication (Cohen and Metzger, 1998), where such communication is considered an active process. Moreover, the brochure, whilst a socio-spatial construct, is also a cultural artefact. As such, and following McDonald’s (2005) lead, I now want to spend some time discussing the physical manifestation of the brochure. Thus I begin with a description of the sensuousness of the brochure, followed by my interpretation of personal readings of the brochure and then an analysis of key themes taken from these readings.

4.4.1 The brochure as material reality
Although I can offer a reading of the visual representation of the brochure, this fails to convey the sensuousness of its materiality and physical acuity. How it feels, smells, and even sounds. Franklin and Crang (2001) for example, argue the role of the brochure in representing the sensuous of tourist practice. However I want to take this further and think of how the senses might be actively employed in the construction of the tourist imaginary. To do so, I am attending to both the non-linguistic (Dicks et al., 2011) aspects and the more-than-representational attributes of the brochure.
Plate 4.1 Brochure – Front Cover
More than merely text, the brochure has a “three dimensional solidity” (Dicks et al., 2006, pg. 82). As such, it is important to employ the body in deconstructing the brochure. What I want to do is to engage in sharing the feeling(s) of ‘doing’ (Crouch, 2001) the brochure as part and parcel of tourist practice – to get the reader to (re)imagine and (re)engage in their own performances with tourist brochures.

On first picking the brochure up, its relative size is clearly apparent. The brochure itself is a rather large and hefty (over 1 kg), and 182 pages in length. Compared to other brochures I had previously and subsequently looked at it, it is both larger in size, slightly larger than A4 paper, as well as having significantly more pages. This all works to represent an impression of quality (Cleveland, 2005) and that the trips inside represent something extraordinary. The pages are shiny and have lustre of glossiness. The reflective qualities of the pages, along with their weight, felt through the thickness (of both page and brochure) give the impression of substance. Even before reading text, I am made aware of the promise and reality of sensuality inherent in, and communicated by, this particular tourist brochure.

All of this conveys to me a feeling of luxury, of expense and speaks to me of the myths of difference (see e.g. Barthes, 1972) that might be carried within the brochure. Importantly, the glossiness of the brochure can also be considered as part of its seductiveness (Iqani, 2012), which works alongside the text and images to represent a particular ideology. To me, this particular publication is manifest as neither a glossy magazine nor advertising print medium. However, it is simultaneously both and as such, a representation of advertising collateral situated as contemporary popular culture (Huisman, 2005).
4.5 Reading the brochure

On opening the brochure there is, dominating the facing page (importantly the first page we view, see e.g. Holsanova, 2006), an image of a heritage building; Rome I think, but there is no inscription to ‘place’ the image. This communicates, to me at least, an expectation of the reader’s cultural capital, required to both read the brochure and consequently to perform the reality of the tour. The power of the facing page in mediating the offering (Holsanova, 2006) is made clear as across the top of the page is text exhorting me to…"CAPTURE THE MOMENT". In hindsight this could have been equally about the imaginary, constructed through immersing myself within the brochure itself, or alternatively the possibilities of exotic encounters “with difference” offered by both the potential and the realities of travel as a lifestyle (Walton, 2010, pg. 1). The left hand page folds out to reveal the image substantially extended over a total of 3 full pages, or around 30 inches by 12 inches.

Now, rather than the building dominating the gaze, my eyes are drawn to the foreground of the page, in which the extended image has revealed a group of people, around thirty, seated at restaurant tables. These are located in the open, in front of the building – and were my first impression of how I might perform everyday activities, such as eating, on tour. These initial three pages represent two particular and competing discourses. I have already, prior to folding out the pages; been informed I will experience “Europe’s breathtaking cities, inspirational sites and unforgettable memories”. However, I now see to the left of the image almost hidden in a font that is perhaps half the size of the text describing the destination, a list containing a rather more functional monologue. Here the brochure begins to describe and mediate the functional aspects of my daily life on tour – “smaller groups; more legroom; quality hotels; delicious dining; personal service”. This can be understood as an attempt by the specialists involved in the production of the brochure, to seamlessly meld together the practicalities of daily life on the road with the exotic culture of destinations. Such oppositional representations are similar to the role of
many types of lifestyle magazines in providing details of ‘reality’ alongside inspiration for “dreams and fantasies” (Stevens and MacLaran, 2005, pg. 287).

I am reminded that whilst I may be expecting the exotic, I still need to function; to perform the banalities of everyday life such as eating and sleeping. Moreover, I am, after all, performing more than the tourist – I am part of a commercial system with consumer ‘demands’ to be met. This reminded me of Smelser’s suggestion that brochures are used to represent four types of space; namely contrived, confined, controlled and confused (2009, after Dann, 1996). Thus, texts in this brochure are used to represent tourist space as both idealised and romanticised but also providing hints of functional life on tour.

4.5.1 Anticipation

For me, along with planning, reading tour brochures was and remains about both day dreaming (Schellhorn and Perkins, 2004), and anticipation (Walton, 2010). Immersing myself in this particular brochure performing as a researcher became ‘labour’ of a kind (Downs, 2010), but was also much more-than-work (Crick, 1995, Bruner, 2005). Here there was a definite blurring of the work – supposed leisure divide (Lewis, 2003). Reading the brochure in itself was pleasurable (Goossens, 2000); the brochure became a space where I began to engage in multiple gazes; my researcher gaze vying for attention with my consumer gaze. The tension here was how the imaginary constructed through the “pleasure of textually and visually consuming seductive lifestyles” (Stevens and MacLaran, 2005, pg. 290) butted up against my attempts to balance these readings with the competing subjectivities of my research(er) gaze. There was an embodied conflict between my researcher-self vying for domination over the anticipation of the tourist-self. This positioned the brochure as a site of anticipated transgression(s) where, as Lichtenberg-Ettinger (1994) would suggest, my current and future identities were entangled in the multiple possibilities of being and becoming.

The opening sentence of the brochure promised that any tour undertaken with this particular company would allow me to “rediscover the golden age of travel” certainly...
something that attracted me as both (tourism) researcher and tourist. More than half of
this first page (inside cover) focused on aspects of everyday life on tour. The text also
represented a particularly historicised narrative, a specific focus on the past, with
continual reference to the suggested romance of travel past (Scott, 2004). This was
communicated in a way that mediated both consumer identity and the subsequent
relationship one might have with this particular company. Here the organisation
explicitly linked the tours in the brochure to values they explicitly associate with
“Thomas Cook’s golden age of touring...”.

In addition to words being used to refer to a ‘better’ past, so too the concomitant images
work to support this particular narrative. For example, located in the centre of the text is
a stylised image of travellers viewing and relaxing around a building that is clearly
meant to represent the heritage one might expect to see if a tour were to be purchased.

The image is further supported with a specific reference to it being a “typical travel
poster styling from the 1920’s”. Through such text the brochure seeks to present and
represent not only the mythologies surrounding Thomas Cook (Harvey, 1989a), but to
also make use of the Belle Époque, as a nostalgic and romanticised period (Gardiner,
1995). However, as with more current tourism narratives, these texts actively hide the
banalities (and indeed hardships) not only of everyday life, but also of daily life on tour
(Harvey, 1989a). There are multiple readings here; certainly the suggestion of the social
distinction (Bourdieu, 1984) expected of the consumer of this tour. There is, however,
also the possibility for a, somewhat ironic, resistance to mass tourism (Munt, 1994). In
purchasing this tour the consumer is marking themselves as belonging (or not) to a
particular group and in turn, dealing with questions of “culture, age, and social class”
(Zukin and Maguire, 2004, pg. 6). Through such images comes the suggestion of tourism
as postmodern (Frow, 1991). The stylised images are a simulation of a romantic, almost
heroic past. It is one that reminded me of Jameson’s (Jameson, 1984, pg. 71) claim of the
postmodern subject as
slowly becoming aware of a new and original historical situation in which we are condemned to seek History by way of our own pop images and simulacra of that history, which itself remains forever out of reach.

Such representations are ways the organisation makes explicit and foreground a type of melancholic nostalgia (Stauth and Turner, 1988), where one “expresses a lament over the homogenization of the contemporary world and nostalgia for historical authenticity and authentic travel” (Turoma, 2010, pg. 55). Again, and ironically, the images in the brochure are presented as an antidote to everyday life in late modernity (Beck et al., 1994), one where the consumers are encouraged to reimage (and reimagine) themselves in the style of an idealised past life (Tudor, 2012).

My initial thoughts about the brochure had been that its focus would be the (pre)construction of what banal and mundane life on tour might look be like; after all minimising risk to ontological security is an important aspect of the continued success of tourism as an industry. It is through representation(s) and mediation of spaces between the mundane and the exotic (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2009), that one at least begins to consider maintenance of daily life away from home. However with this brochure this, at least on the surface, was not the case. Rather, there is an overt attempt to re-mediate the mundane as exotic. Within the brochure, the possibilities of everyday life underwent what Guy Debord (1977) describes as a spectacular dramatization. Through such representations an everyday life on the road that is yet to be lived is actively mediated and (pre)configured in and through the imagination.

References, for example to Thomas Cook, can be considered a response to suggestions of a postmodern condition (Harvey, 1989b) where the brochure’s representation(s) of the realities of everyday life are rather those of a pseudo everyday life. The text appropriates and re-presents particular myths when Thomas Cook’s (personal and company) heritage is yet again invoked and I am encouraged to imagine being comfortable and safe. In
constructing the imaginary I am reassured my ‘comfort’\(^{18}\) will be looked after when I am likened to “those early travellers [who] expected and received personalised service, well planned itineraries and good quality, well located hotels” (Although, unlike these early travellers, I ‘need’ WiFi and a private bathroom (Piper, 2004)). There is an attempt to alter my impression of everyday life; to encourage my (re)imagining of the banal and mundane and to imbue my imagination with a sense of fancifulness. As such, for me, the use value of the brochure changed from that of communicating and mediating the rational choice(s) I had expected (Anastasiadou and Migas, 2014), to (re)defining the mundane and banal as a potential space for exotic performance (Haroutunian and Pashardes, 2005, Jansson, 2002).

Beginning this narrative of a spectacularised everyday life early on in the brochure, there is a suggestion of both the importance of mediating (out) any perceived risk to one’s body, as well as how such representations themselves work to focus the reader on the extra-ordinary possibilities of the experience to come. Here, the brochure is mediating risks associated with the challenge to one’s ability to maintain daily life. It is the taken-for-grantedness of everyday life that enables many western tourists to travel globally and move through cultures. However, it is also such mobility that brings with it inherent challenges to this taken-for-grantedness of daily life and one’s ability to make sense of the world around one (Beck, 1992). Included here are ordinary daily practices such as the food we eat and also how we eat it (Cohen and Avieli, 2004), as well as the challenges of sleeping in ‘strange’ (others) places (Foster, 1982). Whilst this appears banal, it is through such spaces and performances that we run the risk of disruption to those habits and routines of bed time that facilitate a good night’s sleep (Giovanardi et al., 2014).

\(^{18}\) I use comfort here in a general sense to include social, physical and psychological. In this sense the brochure both represents and is of itself material culture – comfortable in a performative capacity (see e.g. Miller, 2009). In chapter five I delve further into different understandings of comfort and the importance of the relationship(s) between comfort and everyday life of the mobile community. In chapter six I use the comfort of ‘stuff’ as symbolic of everyday life to problematise the binary home-away and challenges to one’s ontological security.
The scene is set when I am asked to imagine my...

*coach gliding up to the door of [my] hotel. [I] enter and tour director checks [me] in. Porters unload [my] bags and in no time at all, [I am] relaxing in [my] room and appreciating [my] surroundings. Style and comfort, combined with a sense of tranquillity, truly a home away from home. Shops, bars, cafes and restaurants and historic areas are moments away. This is the art of hospitality at its best. This is an Insight vacation.*

Here, the distinction between the spatialities of the tourist day are further clarified as I am led to believe that “after an exciting day taking in Europe’s great sites, it’s a wonderful feeling to walk through the door of [my] first class hotel, take a deep breath and think to [myself] “isn’t it great to be home”.” Here there is the implied division between my ‘working’ at touring (Jack and Phipps, 2005), and the domestic space of home as supposed respite from workaday life. The brochure uses an implicitly historic narrative to construct a particular imaginary – of the possibility of my not only corporeally engaging with the traces of a ‘grand tour’, but also encouraging me to imagine myself as a part of Veblen’s (1992) leisured classes.

This scene and especially the repeated and explicit representation of the hotel as a ‘home away from home’ work to mediate and preconfigure the mundane performances I am likely to encounter on the tour. Whilst attempting to create a spectacle, through this disconnect between my own mundane life and the promise of the brochure, I am reminded I also perform (and think) as a potential consumer. As consumer, the objective of the organisation is to construct an imaginary where any sense of the messiness associated with everyday life away from ‘home’ is removed. In the imagined space of the tour I will be leaving mundane tasks of daily life to ‘others’. For example, I will have staff, including porters, to deal with the tensions inherent in ‘moving in’ and departing. Likewise, the tour director will be dealing with the overt commercial and mundane performances involved with the technicalities of checking into the hotel. To all intents
and purposes I am to imagine it as a seamless performance and transition – between the coach as the daily commute and walking in the door of the hotel as a (welcome) homecoming after a hard day’s work (I discuss tourism as work in more detail in chapter seven).

The construction and representation of a ‘safe’ imaginary is continued with the mediating (out) of any possible conflict between the reality of my everyday daily life at home and the complications bought about by strangeness; of place – and people. This is achieved by a (re)configuring of my identity to that of the global consumer. Again, a level of social capital is assumed, and my status is acknowledged when I am promised that my hotel will be part of a global brand allowing me to perform distinction (McNeill, 2008) through the consumption of luxury hotel brands (Harkin, 1995). I am informed ours will be different (and of a higher quality) to other tours; we will only be staying in “Sofitel, Intercontinental or Crowne Plaza hotels rather than Holiday Inn, Mercure or Novotel”. Going further, I am told I will receive a “warm welcome in hotels belonging to other top names like Marriott, Sheraton, Radisson SAS, and Hilton”. I am reassured the organisation has chosen hotels of a quality that will meet my consumer demands (Mkono, 2011, Reisinger and Steiner, 2006a). Thus risk is pushed to the background by minimising any uncertainty I might feel, achieved by the implication that these brands are consumed by others like me (Adey, 2002), but also through a complicit understanding between myself and the organisation of my own experiences, imagined or real, with these brands.

However, whilst the imaginary is being constructed (as a pseudo-event) I cannot help but feel that I am being situated as the rationalised consumer. Maybe not the consumer-as-dupe (Ritzer, 2000), but never the less, a suggestion that I am merely along for the ride. Here I beginning to think that maybe I am reading the brochure as a representation of Weber’s (1930/ 2001) iron cage, and the spectacle being represented is merely a structural performance by the organisation in order to mediate out, and control any
feelings of my own increasing (personal) alienation as consumer. I am, in reality, being pacified; the objective of the organisation being to mitigate risk in order to get the sale.

The brochure can be thought of as an institutional site where my intersubjective engagement with the texts and images is implicit in the discursive construction of ‘self’ as an imagined touring individual. However, the tension between my multiple identities is made increasingly clear. On the one hand, I am informed I am the rational(ised) consumer, where “a great deal of consumption has little to do with consumer choice” (Kinley et al., 2012, pg. 232 ) and on the other hand, the organisation is mediating my imagination, leading me to believe I am an empowered actor – an individual with agency, able to make choices . This, in part, is an outcome of the institutional necessity for the brochure to simultaneously balance the representation of the ‘local’ or ‘other’, the utilitarian outcome of the brochure as about selling the extraordinary (Anastasiadou and Migas, 2014), with the tacit mediation of the maintenance of one’s security – the individual’s ability to survive elsewhere. The brochure then can be considered as working to negotiate (and re-imagine) one's ontological position.

The brochure is replete with representations of space. What is especially interesting is when it performs as a space of control, of structures and performances that will act to regulate my everyday life on tour. The imaginary, in the context of this chapter, is of course something that is prior to the reality of tour. In order to achieve this (pre)configuration of (social) space the brochure uses temporal technologies, such as the itinerary to invoke imagined rhythms. These rhythms themselves are also used as a technique to reassure me, through their resemblance to my own lived everyday life (however see chapter six where I discuss resistance to these routines and rhythms). Such rhythms give a tentative voice to those, often silenced, routines and habits of daily life (McCarville et al., 2013).
My day for example, is represented through a discourse of comfort. One where I am promised the tour will be “well-paced...with restful two night stays punctuating the itinerary where necessary...the driving days are not too long and have frequent stops for sightseeing”. The day-to-day itinerary (see appendix A) informs me of the sights and sounds (of difference) I will experience throughout the day – thus fulfilling the ubiquitous nature of these media in controlling encounters (Buck, 1977, Haldrup and Larsen, 2009, Obrador-Pons et al., 2009a). Of particular interest are the routines that control one's performance of the banal and mundane aspects of everyday life. Thus hotels are listed by name; I am informed what meals I am entitled to (or importantly not entitled to). Whilst I have been informed my hotel is a home-away-from-home, the reality is my performance will be constrained, it is not my home rather a (consumer) promise used to mitigate risk. Again a reconfiguration of ‘home’ elsewhere is mediated when ordinary rhythms of (an imagined) daily life on tour will be structured by”...fascinating dining experiences“ where the day begins with a “sumptuous buffet breakfast and on most touring days [I will] enjoy delicious three-course evening meals or buffets”.

Travel is often thought of as a means to experience and possibly embody the exotic that many, often unreflexively, associate with other cultures and places (Harkin, 1995, Foster, 1982). This is achieved through a (re)representation of daily life - a spectacularisation of banal everyday performances. For example, by transforming eating into the opportunity for “authentic dining experiences” where “with [the tour company, [I will] enjoy both regional and international cuisine in local and renowned restaurants and hotels”. Here any risks I might imagine being associated with the exotic are tempered by the integration of local with the global in the commercial space of the restaurant - my simultaneously being a tourist looking for authentic experiences and a consumer with demands to be met (Mkono, 2011, Quan and Wang, 2004). If the local food is too exotic and challenges my identity (Fischler, 1988), I will be able to go back to what I am used to.
Routines and rhythms of eating at home are a part of the social structures and culture in which I live (Wu et al., 2014); they give structure to daily life (Murcott, 1983). Their re-imagining is made explicit through the (re)configuration of eating patterns. The familiar space of eating out, in the commercial and social sense, is invoked to reconfigure what is, after all, a space of difference and thus risk (Desforges, 1997). However, apart from codes signifying buffet breakfast (BB), dinner (D) and highlight dinner (HD) there is no mention of concomitant performances. What am I going to be eating, what time will I be eating, and whom will I be eating with? How do I actually make sense of and ‘do’ all the mundane activities of daily life? Through the brochure I, as tourist, am promised the extra-ordinary. The mundane becomes reimagined as a kind of punctuation mark, breaking down the day and suggestive of comfortable rhythms. Again, the banalities of everyday life have been relegated to my unthinking un-reflexive self.

Whilst I have introduced how accommodation is imagined earlier in this chapter, I want here to use representations of accommodation to explore dwelling. In constructing imaginaries, the brochure manipulates the relationships between ontological security, everyday life and travel. The brochure acts as a form of ephemeral (im)mobility where both language and image work in concert to communicate the performance of dwelling. Here for example, any risk I might feel is assuaged as accommodations I am staying in consist of “welcoming quality hotels...selected from the worlds’ leading brands...centrally located”. I am informed the “Conrad in Istanbul hails from the “luxury brand of the Hilton family””. However “away from Istanbul hotels may vary from the well-known Sheratons and Hiltons to...[those] which specialise in health beauty and fitness”. For me, there is a paradox apparent in the performative possibilities that are inherent in the promised ‘welcome’ in the brochure; both in word and action (Hartmann, 1988). Welcome, in the context of the brochure, becomes about imagining how one might deal with the ability to perform everyday life elsewhere. It is the ‘you’re welcome’ of the tourist staff. However welcome is also performative; it becomes a tacit acknowledgement of difference, enabling one to cross thresholds, for example into an imagined community of the other
(Scott, 2006a). My focus now turns to the (pre)configuration of the imagined community (Anderson, 1991)\(^{19}\).

### 4.5.2 Imagining a touring community

There is a substantial literature on tourism and the destination as an imagined community (see e.g. Bærenholdt et al., 2004, Richards and Hall, 2000), however, my focus here is on how images and language used in the brochure and pertaining to everyday life work towards constructing an *imagined community* of touring individuals.

The text in the brochure, used to represent interpersonal relationships and encounters that I might have with others on tour, has as its focus scale. The dominant discourse is about balancing my individual needs as a tourist and/or consumer, with the practicalities of a group of unknown people travelling together. For example, a discourse of comfort is once again placed in the foreground when I am encouraged to believe that I will “*enjoy a smaller more intimate group*”, but will also be ‘recognised’ as an individual for, “*as the result of the smaller, more intimate group*”, the tour director will have “*more time to devote to [my] individual comfort and personal interests*” (see chapter seven for further discussion of such relations, as both group member and researcher).

Comfort then becomes specifically linked to spatial (and bodily) proximity. The text begins to represent a response to the tensions faced when entering into a group of strangers (Schutz, 1944, Chetty, 2011). Going further, it makes a clear distinction between my tourist-self and any possible conflict with my self-as-consumer. When reading the brochure and subsequently imagining the tourism product and service experience, I am promised a “*more personalised service*”, as having “*fewer guests also* ________________

\(^{19}\) I deal more explicitly with the concept of community in chapter six, and in particular Benedict Anderson's (1961) conception of the 'Imagined Community'. My focus here is to understand the role the text within the brochure plays in the facilitation and bringing together a diverse array of unknown people, in a relatively short space of time and moreover for a relatively short time.
guarantees a better service”. The use of ‘guest’, however, is somewhat of a challenge. Its use here is to suggest an unproblematic blurring of the social performance(s) (Mackay, 1997) that go to inform the identity practice of consumer-as-guest and stranger-as-guest (Scott, 2006a). In saying that, any issues I might have with intimacy are allayed “as travelling with fewer people vastly improves [my] comfort and enjoyment”.

I am, of course, aware that travelling in a group tour includes a necessary imagining of the practicalities of spending extended periods of time aboard a coach with people I do not know. Thus being informed that I will be travelling with a smaller group of people (a common refrain in the text), and, once again in comfort, encourages me to rationalise the coach as having a particular and positive “affective atmosphere [that] has the capacity to bring people closer together” (Pink, 2000, pg. 277). Moreover, time and space are complicit in the formation of both daily rhythms and self when the size of the group becomes, somewhat paradoxically, a mechanism to communicate individuality. I am informed my “tour director too has more time to assist with my personal needs; so [I’ll] be treated as an individual not as one of a crowd”. This reassures me that any feelings of alienation in the group either through the external rules brought to the group (see chapter six), caused by technologies (see chapter seven) (Highmore, 2002a), or even possible ostracism from the group (Nezlek et al., 2012) will not impact on my daily life during the tour as the tour director will ‘look after me’.

Travelling on a tour for a limited period of time obviously places restrictions on the possibility for interpersonal relationships to develop. By restricting numbers of passengers the brochure, on behalf of the organisation, mediates the possibilities for manipulation of interactions and performances within the group. The company suggests they “know [my] tour will be an enriching, stylish and pleasurable journey of discovery. Not just as a result of [the tour companies] superb value, style and quality; but” more importantly because “experience shows that it is the people you’ll meet on tour, locals and fellow travellers, that will turn a great vacation into a memorable one”. The idea of travel
producing positive outcomes such as global friendships (Clarke, 2004b), is made clear with the comment that I will “meet like-minded travellers from all over the English speaking world so it’s easy to make lifelong friends, sharing memories of [my] tour for years to come”. I feel it is important here to acknowledge the explicit use of like-minded as well as ‘English’ speaking. In using such language the ‘experts’ involved in the production of the brochure, whilst allowing me to imagine my-self as traveller, ameliorate the risk of my being ‘othered’, on the coach at least, by making use of the brochure as a rhetorical device. This is achieved by constructing an interiorising imaginary – where those on tour will be like me (see chapter six for further discussion), and the gaze will be, rather than on me, focused on others outside the group (Crossley, 2006). The personality and performance of place (Bærenholdt et al., 2004) is invoked in the sentence immediately following the one above where the tour operator will “also introduce [me] to raconteurs, artisans, restaurateurs and local characters who make up the character of each place [I] visit”.

### 4.5.3 Identity and everyday encounters with the ‘other’ (imagining self)

Any possible tensions coming from encounters between my touring (and researcher) self and toured other (Galani-Moutafi, 2000) that might pose a challenge to my performance of self, are dealt with in a number of ways in the brochure. Here I want to make use of one particular discursive strand where the brochure played to a particular cultural identity. The tour I undertook included a visit to a site that has particular resonance for my self-identification as a New Zealander. This acted as affective mediation of the identity I perform on a daily basis and is central to who I see myself as (Byrne et al., 2009).

---

20 Obviously not all ‘friendships’ made whilst travelling end up being positive – see for example THOMAS, M. 2005. ‘What happens in Tenerife stays in Tenerife’: Understanding women’s sexual behaviour on holiday. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 7, 571-584..
A featured part of the itinerary was a visit to Gallipoli peninsular, a site of an extended battle during the First World War. This is an important place, suggested as being a contested site central to the construction of the modern national identity of three countries: Turkey, New Zealand and Australia (McQuilton, 2004). From a personal perspective, a number of my own relatives saw ‘action’ at Gallipoli, which combined with the current resurgence in interests in identity and the search for belonging in New Zealand (Bell, 2009), meant that this part of the itinerary resonated deeply. Aware of this groundswell in interest (the 150th anniversary of the battle is in 2015), the tour operator appealed directly to my sense of national identity (or consciousness) when suggesting this tour may be especially suitable for me as “[many] Australians and New Zealanders book this trip for the emotive visit to Gallipoli”. Again I am informed that those with whom I will travel will not disrupt my daily life – rather, the encounters I will have with others in the group will enhance my performance of everyday national identity (Edensor, 2002).21

4.5.4 Dealing with others

Language is used to mitigate risk, when it is suggested this tour “is suitable for first time travellers as well as those who want to experience a slightly exotic tour”. The ability for the tour operator to mediate boundary crossing, for example encounters with others and manage everyday performance(s) is made clear when I am informed my “tour director [will act] as [my] “Personal Concierge” and that they will assist with the labyrinth of languages, customs, regulations and currencies; organise hotel and airport check-ins; and help [me] make the most of [my] free time during each leisurely stay”.

Here I am to make use of the tour director’s ability to negotiate their own personal everyday lives in their homelands. Coming from the destination (in this case Turkey), the tour director acts as cultural broker (Reisinger and Steiner, 2006a, Steiner and Reisinger, 

21 Whilst it is suggested that there are cultural similarities between Australians and New Zealanders (see for example, Green 2006), as the sole ‘New Zealander’ on this tour, the differences were made clear to me through actual performances of everyday life on the road – which I discuss in detail in chapter five.
It is through her/his ability to mediate space and my socialisation into place that enables me to make sense of my own (imagined) everyday life on tour. In a number of instances the language used implicitly engages in a discourse that constructs and mediates everyday crossing of physical (and spatial and cultural) divides. I am relieved to find that “as part of the [operators] attention to detail, [they] have arranged an included arrival and departure transfer from the airport to [my] hotel and vice versa, no matter on which flight you arrive and depart”\textsuperscript{22}. Again, as above, the imaginary is mediated through the mitigation of risk to one’s ontological security when passing through the unknown and strange. Here the tour director becomes a guide, where they act to not only negotiate my entry into and out of the spaces of the other, but additionally across the places and spaces of becoming (Adey, 2002) where, for example, the space between airport and bus and hotel might function as liminoid spaces (Davidson, 2003a).

Importantly, my daily life as a consumer will be maintained. Shopping, a commonly sought tourist activity (Kinley et al., 2012), as well as everyday leisure activity (McCarville et al., 2013), will not only be facilitated, but would become a key part of my tourist experience. Both in shopping itself, but also by my (safe) immersion in the ‘others’ everyday made possible through retail encounters, I am informed that I "will be taught to haggle in the Grand Bazaar", and moreover “beat the shopkeepers at their own game”. Thus giving me the skills needed to perform an everyday activity whilst also facilitating what is seen by many as an integral part of the tourist experience (Wu et al., 2014).

\textsuperscript{22} In writing this part of the section my memories of reality came into conflict with both my written notes and my memories of planning. The reality was that I was not met at the airport. I like to think that I am a seasoned traveller, however in this instance my not being met led to a number of issues which are discussed in more detail in chapter seven.
4.6 Images and representation

Whilst I have considered the brochure as advertising collateral, it also works on other levels. It might be seen as containing both advertising and magazine narratives, being both more than advertising and less than a magazine (see e.g. Huisman, 2005). As such I now regard the brochure as an amalgamation of a number of Appadurai’s (1996) ‘scapes’; as space(s) of encounter where it works both distinctively and at times collectively as ethnoscape, mediascape, technoscape and ideoscape.

Given the underlying commercial function of the tourist brochure, concepts such as ideoscape encouraged me to discover and understand new (for me) meaning both in and of the brochure. Of particular interest when thinking about commercial consumption is how the brochure can be considered as a material realisation of a consumerist ideoscape. The brochure as both social space and material culture acts to bring together a number of disparate images that communicate an economic (neo-liberal) narrative containing a “chain of ideas, terms and images” (Appadurai, 1996, pg. 36). In the tourist brochure we find this as images that represent globalisation, consumerism and rationalisation. The tourist brochure, as material artefact, thus provides one “the pleasure of textually and visually consuming” the tourism product and service as a “seductive [consumer] lifestyle” choice (Stevens and MacLaran, 2005).

In imagining habits and routinisation of daily life on tour, the brochure appropriates and reconfigures particular performances more normally associated with rhythms that make up everyday life at home. The focus then becomes a privileging of one imaginary (and indeed reality) over another. As such, the organisation manipulates and restricts discourse in order to mediate the construction of a commercial and furthermore rationalised imaginary (in our own minds). As a consequence, the discourse of everyday mundane life is resituated via a (re)presentation of international hotels, hotel bedrooms,
restaurants, cafes and bars, and thus, as overtly McDonaldized\textsuperscript{23} (Ritzer, 2001), or possibly more appropriately in a post-modern sense – everyday life on tour is a proliferation of McDisneyised spaces of consumption (Bryman, 2004a).

The images used for such space(s) and performance(s) are representations of ironic but ‘acceptable’ consumer experience. These work together to subvert any possible imagining of unmediated encounters with the other(s) everyday life. In part this is also achieved through the affective capacities of images and texts within the brochure. The affective outcome is to exoticise the mundane on tour as a (luxury) commodity (Giovanardi et al., 2014). Eating and sleeping becomes remediated, as more-than-necessity. Through representations in the brochure they become more-than-banal; everyday life takes on the cloak of re-enchantment, re-imagined as a consumer leisure pastime (Warde and Tampubolon, 2002, Warde and Martens, 2000, Warde et al., 2007, Riley, 1994). Thus, the banal itself becomes open to contestation in being represented and re-represented as the exotic. This however, is to problematise the argument put forward by Meethan et al (2006, pg. 166) where they posit “representation is not necessarily a form of power and dominance but rather a field of negotiation…. [where] the images created by official and/or professionals’ gaze are interpreted and even challenged by consumers”. Here the focus on the representation(s) of the banal is to restrict any and all negotiation by the rationalised consumer. For example, when the idea of the ‘comfort stop’ is introduced in the brochure, it is a particular narrative of commercialised material comfort that dominates – where the realities of lunch at a truck stop or the encounters in a public toilet remain hidden from the imagination (see chapter six for the realities of daily life on the road).

\textsuperscript{23} This is not to say that these imagined experiences are reminiscent of McDonalds, rather I use Ritzer’s thesis to suggest the construction and communication of a global and rationalised hospitality system as purveyor of those so called tourism support activities that provide for the ontological security of the tourist-as-modern. In effect and affect – the commodification of aspects of everyday life (see chapter six).
The brochure therefore has a certain opacity. It presents as a paradox – representing both the possibilities of the exotic, negotiation and change, as well as ensuring the mediation of the requisite stability that will ensure maintenance of one's daily life in what could possibly be a strange place. The necessary (often messy) performances of one's daily life are repackaged as commercial consumption, maintaining a façade of the exotic through the mediation of (luxury) consumer lifestyles. Thus, for me, the brochure might be thought of as neither here nor there, rather here and there.

Of particular concern when thinking of how images mediate the commodified everyday life of the tourist is the use of various forms of labour, including aesthetic (Nickson and Warhurst, 2006), affective (Hardt and Negri, 2000, Bolton, 2009) and emotional (Hochschild, 1975). This is furthered through the use of words such as ‘comfort’ whereby activities that we would normally perform at home – such as cooking (and cleaning) will be carried out by some other hidden person – more often than not in hospitality a woman (Bolton, 2009). However, such images also represent symbolic violence. Here I mean “symbolic violence as a process of social reproduction” (Ellis, 1991, pg. 103) or the implied violence in the ‘othering’ happening through the representations mediated through the brochure.

Producing and eating food, along with the attendant performances of the meal, carry with it both physical and cultural risk (Cohen and Avieli, 2004).
In particular, plate 4.3, (re)mediates and works to remove such risk to the background or preferably, out-of-mind. It achieves this through assumptions of the cultural and social capital of the viewer, educated for example, through lifestyle television programmes that position the chef as celebrity (Skidelsky, 2004). Such mediation also works to position the (white, male) chef as expert (Chossat and Gergaud, 2003). Images such as this position the staff as “individualized, he or she is also understood as embodying a social category of persons. These bodies on show display an ‘incorporated history’”. This knowledge, along with that gained from an increase in eating away from home (Mitchell and Scott, 2013), situates the restaurant as an everyday leisure activity. In the image above, this remediation is achieved through a number of performances – both cultural and social. Here the chef is represented as ‘host’, if not in power at least in being an equal (Gibson, 2007).

Meanwhile, and problematically, the wait staff (culturally and symbolically different) is positioned in a subservient position, head bowed, proffering himself to both the tourist and consumer. There is a displacement apparent here – space and place playing to cultures of consumption (Lury, 1996). Although a ‘local’ will ‘serve’ me, the implication is that my food will prepared for me by one from my culture.
Again the viewer’s social capital is brought into play. The taken-for-grantedness of daily life maintained through table setting and overt performances of the staff, as well as ubiquitous product; wine and bread rolls. Place, if at all present, is again represented through ones reading of the ethnicity of staff. The tourist is brought into place through the use of symbolic violence performed not in situ (Harrison, 2003), rather through the imaginary.

4.6.1 Mediating the exotic

The brochure overtly mediates an exotic imaginary, sanitised of the mundane and banal – fulfilling the expectation of its viewers of the possibility for extra-ordinary experiences. Highlighting, for example, both escape and exploration. Here, the success of the brochure as a promotional tool is dependent upon the dominant narrative being the representation of “a fantasy of an eroticized and exoticized Orient which has been created in the Western mind” (Chetty, 2011, pg. 63).

However, in constructing this fantasy, or imaginary and ontological security, or the ability to maintain daily life, the brochure is necessarily (re)constituted as a space of non-reflexive practice. As such the brochure works to ensure the reader does not delve too deeply into the realities of strange encounters (both corporeally and embodied) that exist outside touristic representation of otherness. Thus paradoxically, the brochure can be considered a space of disenchantment, where the dominant representation is one where the covert commodification of everyday life configures the imagination of the individual-as-tourist; subsumed by the “dominant norms of participation that advantage powerful groups” (Stephens, 2007 pg. 950).

The brochure, in a structural sense, represents ideological discourses of consumerism and acts as a mirror of the market (Holzer, 2006). Any (imagined) possibility for enchantment that might occur within the mundane and banal of daily life elsewhere is subverted by hegemonic ideologies carried by and within the brochure through its focus
on mediating and representing rationalised consumer choices (Crouch et al., 2001). In our engagement with the brochure as, in the main, un-reflexive, individuals our internal dialogues become managed (Cunha and Gonçalves, 2009), if not silenced. However if the commercial (and carefully choreographed) imaginary that the brochure sets out to construct is able to be disrupted, then one might become attuned to the enchanted possibilities of and choices in everyday life on tour (see chapter seven). In the imagination, the brochure is a space where these (possibly) meaningful choices are less-than- realised. The performance of the brochure becomes one between organisation and a rationalised and passive consumer. Ultimately, as I have suggested, possibilities of the quotidian of everyday life away from home become hidden beneath the veneer of consumer ‘choice’.

On first sight the brochure might be regarded as representative of a stable modernity. It is the utilitarian value that is important; the mediation of a commodified everyday life represented by, for example, the standardised offering of globally branded hotels. However, for me, the brochure offered a reading more appropriately (and somewhat more prosaically) thought of in the context of liquid modernity (Bauman, 2000). Rather than merely concentrating on communicating use value to the rational consumer, it actively and as importantly affectively, reconfigured the identity of the reader, from the individual looking for the exotic to the rationalised consumer. Through aesthetic and affective considerations, the brochure engages one’s emotions. The brochure is, for all intents and purposes, a lifestyle guide – where it is a manifestation of

a more or less integrated set of practices which an individual embraces, not only because such practices fulfil utilitarian needs, but because they give material form to a particular narrative of self-identity (Giddens, 1991, pg. 81).

The importance of the brochure in identity construction is to do with how it mobilises the imaginary as a transition zone or liminal space. A space where the tour is initially (pre)configured and the tourist undergoes a rehearsal of the possible realities to come.
The brochure thus becomes a type of *rites de passage*, something that is (constructed,) performed and consumed as a central tenet in the ritualised performance of the tourist-in-becoming.

In thinking of the possibilities that tourism might offer the individual, the role of ontological security takes on new importance. The part the brochure plays in mediating daily life is crucial for both the organisation and the consumer as tourist-in-becoming. It imagines and promotes trust, enabling the negotiation between potential encounters with strangeness and the ability to make sense of and survive in complex tourist spaces (Cohen and Metzger, 1998). It is through the brochure that the genesis of an ontologically secure tourist begins; the becoming of the tourist self, shaped in a large part by "the social and the symbolic" (Cohen, 1998, p. 595) representations. Here, the brochure is posited as standing in as a transitional space between home and away.

Rather than primarily an optic space, the brochure takes on the form of an embodied performance - something to be sensed. The sensuousness of the brochure, the combination of touch and feel, the glossiness, the bright colours and (re)presentation of the brochure itself as spectacle became lodged in my imagination and subsequently acted to preform and further contest my multiple selves. Here I am suggesting my tourist self (in becoming) was wowed by the spectacle, however my thinking and considered researcher self attempted to resist this identity construction, wanting to see the brochure as smoke and mirrors. On the one hand, my consumer self is open to the supposed touristic allure of the exotic, on the other my researcher self, through critical engagement with the brochure and its spatial configurations attempted, at some level, to resist its rationalising overtures.
4.7 Summary

My brochure is now dog-eared, covered in coffee stains – my (actual) dog has, it appears, attempted to read it – pages are torn and folded over, and to the horror of my partner it has written inscriptions throughout. It has been used variously and somewhat unproblematically as a place mat for dinner. It has been carried with me around the world – it was, is and I suspect will remain a part of my everyday life.

My discussion in this chapter has attempted to explore the material and embodied performance of the brochure as part and parcel of the realities of my everyday life in the context of this thesis. After all, planning for field work is much the same as planning for holiday: options explored, pros and con’s weighed up and decisions made. The brochure played a twofold role – as a functional part of my planning where, as Peters, Kloppenburg, & Wyatt (2010, pg. 350) suggest, corporeal (and other) mobility “…is more than just travelling from one place to another; it is also about arriving at the right place, on time, with the necessary things, often at the same time as significant others” and additionally as a form of everyday practice that became the locus for analysis.

I set out in this chapter to show how the brochure does something – how it acts as a performative space that works in concert with the imagination as transitional space. As such, I regard the brochure as one of those “transitional objects [that] stand in for social contact” whilst continuing to act as a “symbolic act of communication” (Cohen and Metzger, 1998, pg. 51). In the construction of an imaginary, the images and texts themselves become the mediated representations of everyday performances. These then go on to re/pre-configure the social actor by mediating the narrative of everyday life as it makes and re-makes the social actor as tourist. What I mean here is that by the manipulation of discourses of everyday life, the brochure allows the transition between the safety of everyday life at home, and the risks and challenges to one’s ontological security posed by representations (and potential realities) of the exotic. It does this by
constructing an imaginary to move the actor seamlessly (and safely) from the space of the everyday at 'home' to the (possible) spaces of everyday life elsewhere (in a strange land) through the reproduction of particular (economic) ideologies.

The individual as active agent (Pink, 2000, Giddens, 1991) is (re)placed by the viewer as rationalised subject, located within a culture of consumerism. I have shown that whilst on the surface the brochure is about difference – the search for the exotic or the break from the rituals and routines of everyday life - it is the re-presentation of these performances that is at the core of the imaginary. It is through the production (and consumption) of these imaginaries, the images and texts of the banal, that the individual moves between one-self and self-as-tourist in becoming. Thus the brochure might, metaphorically, be thought of as a chrysalis stage, the nascent tourist ready to be awoken through corporeal mobility. Ironically, everyday life is at the heart of the brochure. If these aspects were not represented, then one’s ontological security would be challenged as no imaginary is being constructed. After all, how can one imagine daily life on the road without a supporting narrative? Ultimately, for me, the brochure works as a dialogic space through the syncretic co-production of tourist imaginaries. Rather than the everyday and the exotic in opposition the brochure acts to fulfil its potential as a dialectic device.

What I found to be particularly important in my deconstruction of the tourist brochure has been to challenge particular spatial representations of the banal and mundane. I have done this in order to give context for both the field work, but more importantly to explore and begin to understand the group tour as a social imaginary. I needed to understand the investments I had made in texts and practices such as the tourist brochure, what meanings they might bring to (my possible) everyday life on tour and the significance of this engagement between me as reader (as technician) and the brochure as techné (De Certeau, 2002). In analysing the representations of everyday life communicated by the tour brochure I wanted to problematise those representations as
being a primarily a sui *generis* sensibility – where there is a resituating of the taken-for-grandness of the mundane and banal as merely a part of the commercial(ised) aspect of toursitic performance. In so doing, I hope I have moved beyond the more superficial accounts of the banal within tourist representations, towards making explicit through this exploration of the mundane, the complicated power relations that exist within the brochure as an institutional site.

Finally, my intention in this chapter has been to implicate the affective performance of the brochure in the construction of the tourist imaginary and in turn how this informs our mindfulness of everyday life on the road that has yet to materialise. However, and importantly, this ‘mindful’ imagination is not configured at our own behest. Rather, the organisation, possibly with complicit support, is also implicated. An important way to understand myself, and potential fellow group members, was through thinking about and analysing the production and consumption of tourist representations (Edwards, 1996), such as the tourist brochure, and how they mediate such tourist imaginaries. As Shields (1991, pg. 8) might put it, the brochure as a socio-spatiality has an epistemic and ontological importance – it is part and parcel of our notions of reality, truth and causality...[one] could suggest that [such] a discourse of space and our relations with these perceptions are central to our everyday conceptions of ourselves and of reality.

These imaginaries of the tour, as discussed in this chapter will be referred back to in the following chapter, where I introduce my (and other) realities and the extent to which they were implicated (or not) in the actuality of my everyday life on tour.

To me, and as Appadurai (1996, pg. 34) might suggest, the brochure engaged with my wish to “fulfil the fantasy of wanting to move”. The brochure is about mobilities – its own mobility, the mobilising of latent identities and imaginations and the possibilities afforded to/for corporeal mobility. As such I now turn, in the following chapter, to
comparing these mobile imaginaries with the realities of everyday life within a nascent community on the move.
Chapter Five: **The coach as transformational space**

### 5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter my focus was on the tour group brochure and the interactions and performances that make it touristic and yet also everyday material culture. An outcome of the brochure was the effect and affect of particular representations and the subsequent formation of a tourist imaginary. As an imaginary the brochure, as socially constructed space, worked to pre-configure the everyday life of the tourist yet-to-be. Such social imaginaries encourage the investigation of ways of interaction and performance and enable understanding of the possibilities afforded by the dialogic and dialectical space(s) through which we organise and make sense of our daily existence. That is, how we "fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations which are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images which underlie these expectations..." (Taylor 2004: pg. 23-24).

In this chapter my focus turns to the realisation of the mobile self. Here I explore the intersection of imagined (imagination) and real (reality). Importantly, my attention turns to contextualising the tour group; the beginnings of an affective and proximate construction of the mobile community. Central to this discussion are the initial encounters I had with those who were to become significant others during (and after) the fieldwork episode. I explore and analyse both the initial interactions and encounters with social actors and objects. Of importance in this chapter is in understanding the interplay between a discursive deployment of the imaginary and the possibility for performative and affective engagement(s). This is significant, as it was such spaces that worked on identity construction.

The fieldwork for this thesis took place within a temporally bounded space, the group tour. Accordingly, the tour group acted to mark out the construction of a particular site of
difference. Here I suggest the tour group (as an entity) initially stood outside of my own everyday life. That being said, there are performances of everyday life, which one needs to enact in order to survive in the world of the FIGT (eating and abluting for example). As such understanding the context of the group within which I performed encouraged me to think (reflexively) about how the performance of everyday life might be considered a performative achievement. Furthermore, such performances were implicit in the (re)configuration of the group as a particular type of community. The discussion of group thus gives context to the establishment of everyday existence on the coach – after all some eight hours a day (over twelve hours moving between overnight stops) was spent giving context for daily existence.

This chapter consists of two intersecting parts. Initially my objective is to develop context for the mobilising of a group of individuals. Firstly I discuss what I understand as a primary space of the tour – the coach, and differentiate this space from that of another everyday form of mobility, the bus. In the second part of the chapter I engage with data that seeks to explore the construction of a mobile community. A particular focus of my discussion is the relations between identity and daily life on the coach. This includes, for example, processes of coming together. Here the banal practices of everyday life on tour are situated as central to the socialisation of individuals. Through exploring the unremarkable (micro social) aspects of everyday life on tour I argue that the social processes of and within banal performances and practices act to reconfigure the tour group as a kind of temporally bound mobile community akin to Bauman's (2007). Cloakroom Community.

Rather than using community indiscriminately I want to give meaning to what I understand community to be, but also to employ community as means of giving context and boundaries to my encounters and experiences within the field, as one core discussion within this chapter is the focus on dynamics of belonging.
5.2 The tour

There is a growing corpus of knowledge that seeks to understand the corporeal mobilities of daily life, by, for example, exploring how one makes use of public transport when commuting (Silk, Vannini, 2012, Jain, 2009, Löfgren, 2008a). This however, disregards how we make sense of those particularised (everyday) mobilities that effect and affect daily life whilst away-from-home. This is of particular importance to me in this chapter; as it is not only our ties to culture, or roots that are important, but also it is the routes we take to get there that matters (Vannini, 2012). Thus, for me to understand the relationship between identity and the daily life of the individual-as-tourist, I needed to explore the ways in which ways of life come out of the FIGT as a situated (im)mobility.

To me, corporeal mobility is both stabilising and disruptive. However in thinking this way, the stability of daily life is open to contestation. It is therefore useful to, at least initially, think of the group tour as a constellation of mobilities (Cresswell, 2010). By this I am referring to the speed, rhythm(s), route(s), feel and friction of the tour bus and its inhabitants (Edensor and Holloway, 2008). It is equally important to acknowledge the FIGT existing as both an association of individuals as well as and part of a much wider tourism assemblage (Cresswell, 2010, Vannini, 2012). Thus in exploring the daily life of those on a FIGT I make use of the constituent performances, processes, narratives and experiences that went towards the realities of this group tour. As such, the tour needs contextualised within a wider set of processes, actions and thought. The tour itself is an affective amalgamation of home (space(s), place(s) performance(s)), of technologies, of transit (travel agents, brochures, taxis, buses, airports, aircraft and routes), along with the realities of daily life, to construct the FIGT.

Such assemblage(s) are conditioned by pervasive (and persuasive) mobilities. For example, the physical baggage we choose to take with us on holiday, shampoo and clean underwear and the myriad of other objects and materialities needed for everyday life at
home and elsewhere. However these also intertwine with embodied 'baggages’ (Jack and Phipps, 2005) which encompass emotions, memories and other performances and practices that are tied up within the social self. Such material and cultural baggage became, to a greater or lesser extent, a performance of the collective daily lives that were to be unpacked and repacked on the road. It was these mundane and overlooked details of everyday life that worked to produce and reproduce the social and cultural norms that mediated, and in turn, became mediated by the corporeal (im)mobilities of the tour group in the space of the coach.

5.3 Giving context – Mobility through material culture

For many, the bus is an integral part of daily life. More often than not however, it is thought of (if at all) as merely a mode of daily transport, part of the taken-for-granted commute between home and work. Little effort or energy is employed in reflecting upon how spaces such as the bus are socially constructed and deployed. Rather the technologies and practice of commuting fade into the background (until it goes wrong). The bus then might be considered a normative space – where it both normalises and in turn is normalised by the performance of social actors. This however results in the "disappearance of context” (Elliott and Lemert, 2006pg. 10), wherein the social (spatial) construction of the bus is challenged by the dominancy of individual over social and collective performance(s) (Beck, 1992). No longer is the bus of interest as a space of encounter but rather considered merely of interest to those involved in the study of transport policy and planning, transport geography and deregulation of public services. This has the result of desensitising many researchers to opportunities of the bus as a site of enquiry.

A lack of academic interest in the bus, even as an integral part of much tourism activity is not surprising. After all, the use value of the bus is the reproduction of an everyday mobility that is “enduring, predictable, habitual” (Binnie et al., 2007pg. 166). Enquiry is
focused upon how the tourist is to be moved between points on a map, or more prosaically, between attractions in the brochure. Along with the familiarity of the ‘bus’ as an everyday locale rather than an exotic space, this perhaps leads to a perception of the mobility of the FIGT being a part and parcel of the unreflexive everyday life of ‘home’; as a result thought of as banal, and for many ‘boring’ and thus not worthy of knowing.

5.3.1 Bus or Coach?
Before going further with my discussion on the coach tour and in order to minimise issues of interpretation I want to briefly introduce and clarify what I understand as the distinction between the concept of bus and coach. For some this might seem mere semantics, however as both can be considered social constructions they are open to contestation. Of course, both have as their concern the mobilising of bodies. It is, however, necessary to remember the "mobile body is affected by all kinds of phenomena that are not necessarily part of the goal of that particular journey" (Bissell, 2012b, pg. 9).

In my native country, New Zealand, the term bus would be understood by many to signify the type of transport used by tourists (or others) undertaking an inclusive group tour. However, for others, the connotation of the bus is something rather more straightforward. Here the bus becomes something utilitarian, more appropriately manufactured for use in urban, or peri-urban routes and often made use of by commuters who queue for their ride at bus stops (Moran, 2005). Additionally, the bus is often considered to be a form of ‘public’ transport – although under neo-liberal regimes most are likely to be operated by private enterprise. In contrast, the coach is regarded as a means of transport used for longer distance trips, or conversely shorter private trips – for example transfers from airports (Dickinson and Lusdon, 2010). Whilst I acknowledge that the term coach is also used to signify a class of travel in parts of the world including the United States of America, in this thesis the concept of coach will be used to signify the means of transport as well as a space of dwelling-in-travel.
5.3.2 Spatialising the coach/why the coach?

The coach, thought of as predominantly a material object, focuses attention primarily on its instrumentality or use value. As a result there is a lack of understanding about the role the coach plays in the construction of the multiple mobilities, performances and identities of the individuals themselves. As such, the possibility of the coach as a socio-spatial entity are more often than not overlooked. Furthermore, as a symbolic space of economic generation, the coach becomes a de-territorialised space of performance, resulting in what might be considered, tourist alienation. The coach becomes to all intents and purposes Auge’s ‘non-place’ (2008, 1995). Not only does the coach lose (social) identity by becoming dis/placed, but additionally the identity and role of the passenger inside is treated as unproblematic – the social actor as passenger is (pre)configured as the global consumer. Certainly from the organisation’s perspective their strategy is to produce and re-produce the coach as a rationalised space. As such the individual-as-consumer on board the coach becomes a spatial realisation of the metaphorical tourist ‘just passing through’ (Digance and Cusak, 2002).

The coach is obviously a part of a much larger institutional performance (Stough and Rietveld, 1997), including a core enabler of mass tourism (Obrador-Pons et al., 2009a). Moreover, the coach might, on the surface, be said to correspond to Crang’s (2011), notion of constrained mobility. After all, one sits in the coach for extended periods of time, seemingly still, and yet is able to cover considerable distances. However, this is to view the FIGT through an institutional lens. Coach travel relegated to being “a passive, spectacle-orientated, disembodied and superficial pursuit” (Edensor and Holloway, 2008, pg 486 my italics). Finally, it is important in the context of communitas to locate the bus as part of one’s normal culture – something that is part of the structure of day-to-day life. However the coach (re)presents opportunities for difference and the freeing of inhabitants from their everyday lives (see section 5.9 below).
5.3.3 Coach tours

A suggested rationale for tourists choosing coach tours is the ability to travel in pleasant surroundings and maintain a sense of equilibrium whilst travelling through what, for many, might be considered a strange place (Dickinson and Lusdon, 2010). The coach plays to the psychological needs of the tourist where the individual’s state of mind appears to involve being transported whilst switched off. It is smooth, tranquil, undisturbed, relaxed [yet] absorbed, engaged with the moment, but elsewhere and is pleasurable without being ecstatic (Stradling and Anable, 2008, pg. 290).

Or, as Dickinson & Lusdon (2010, pg. 151) argue; the coach tour is to all intents and purposes about providing a “passive travel option with fixed itineraries”. However this is to neglect possible (relational) agency as well as overlooking the multitude of mobilities that go towards the performance and realisation of the coach as integral to the group tour. Furthermore, it is to ignore the relationship between the material and immaterial, between encounters with fellow passengers, the bus as material artefact alongside those objects and stuff (Miller, 2009b, Miller, 2009a), brought with us on the FIGT.

In ignoring the stuff of everyday life with which we travel we run the risk of being rendered “blind to the fact that ‘nonhumans’ such as objects and technologies enable human agency and are crucial in making leisure and tourism geographies happen-able and perform-able” (Haldrup and Larsen, 2006b, pg. 276). Thinking in other ways allows the construction of alternative representations of coach based touristic performance. In engaging with the micro-social spatialities of the coach one comes to understand the multiple rhythms implicit within the performance of tour (Edensor and Holloway, 2008).

From the perspective of the tourist imaginary the coach might be considered an institutional space – a material object through which the tour company (as agent of the tourism industry) represents the comfortable movement around a particular tourist
destination. However, we as individuals were undoubtedly, as I will show, implicit in the social construction and reconstruction of the tour coach. In the following section I explore the ways in which the tour group became more than merely a simple collective.

5.4 A group tour, or a community in the making?

In the previous chapter I talked of the social imaginary the enabled us, ahead of time, a way of making sense of how we might, during the tour, "fit together with others" and in turn achieve a wider “shared sense of legitimacy” about the FIGT (Taylor, 2002, pg. 23-24). Before we had even left home we had already (pre)configured a shared space, a kind of imagined community (Anderson, 1991). However, this was a community mediated through texts, discursively constructed through talk of similarities, of how we would share experiences.

Knowledge of small scale encounters and interactions in the FIGT requires an understanding of community as a symbolic construction (Cohen, 1985); those interactions and encounters through which we communicate understandings of community. For example, the “imagery, boundary marking processes, customs, habits, rituals (and routines)” (Blackshaw, 2010, pg. 6) that happened over the course of the tour and that are also invoked in the actual construction and maintenance of these same communities. Thus understanding was developed about the relations between the symbols communicated by the community and the roles of these symbols in the formation, structuring and functioning of the community (Blackshaw, 2010).

The idea of community is problematic. For me, community is a concept that is at once both challenged by my post-structural thinking (although traces still remain), but appears increasingly relevant in the disjointed, highly mobile world in which I find myself. In the context of the tour it led me to question the notion of collective(s) - why did we need community; how did the rituals and routines of daily life mediate
community and importantly, identity? Following Blackshaw (2010), my thoughts on community were initially, in part, a response to Bauman's (2000) idea of liquid modernity. A key idea here is that we have moved from what might be termed a solid social modernity to what might be better thought of as a liquid modern sociality. As such primacy is given to the individual-as-consumer (Bauman, 2007).

Whilst I use concepts of community I do not want to define community as either this or that. To do so is, to me, problematic given the wide ranging definitions of community (as well as common understandings) (Blackshaw, 2010, Day, 2006, Brint, 2001, Watson and Bennett, 2002). Rather, my focus is to look at everyday banal practices that we take with us as we leave home – and how these are subsequently mobilised (in multiple ways, both corporeally and embodied), and how these in turn constructed *gemeinschaft relations* that manifested as a type of temporally and spatially bounded community (Brint, 2001).

Historically the community has been understood as an appropriating device; for example, in using the ‘host’ community for the development of policy in relationship to tourism. Or, in contrast the community as an orientating device, where the researcher categorises and defines community in a particular way (Blackshaw, 2010). Community in late modernity has, what is suggested as a weak ontology (White, 2005, White and White, 2009). As such, to me, the community functions as a space in which the “conceptualisations of the self, other and world are contestable” (White, 2000, pg. 8) and that this is necessarily to ensure my reflective, ethical, social and political self. Therefore, how I come to understand the community in which I travel is central to how I, as an individual, see and reflect upon my experiences in the field (and indeed wider world) (Blackshaw, 2010).

---

24 Whilst this is about a temporally bound mobile community, traces remain to this day. See chapter 7 for further discussion.
Central to the possibility of individual and collective agency were those performances that occurred during initial encounters. These were interactions, not merely with each other but also with the material and social fabric of the coach - a social space in which we were to spend an extended period of time in relative proximity. More importantly, it was the interactions with space and bodies that occurred in the first day or so which encouraged an understanding of transitional time and space, in turn facilitating the formation of a type of temporary community. As Day (2006, pg. 4) suggests, “potential for community can be found wherever people engage in social interactions”. The possibility of the group tour existing as a community thus requires an understanding of community in the context of scale. Specifically I include not only those “relationships grounded in interaction at the local level” (Day, 2006, p. 152), but also the idea of the systems and processes at work that brought us from various parts of the world and enabled the coach as ‘locale’ (or locus) of potential community. I do this whilst acknowledging the importance (or the impact) of the wider structural composition of the community.

5.5 Towards community

As tourists on the coach we were undoubtedly a part of a wider (tourism) as well as specific (located) community of practice (Bærenholdt and Haldrup, 2006). However this occurred alongside a community that came into existence because of social interactions (and in spite of institutional constraints), at both inter-personal and inter-cultural level (Wenger, 1998). To me, it was everyday social encounters that enabled the FIGT to be both, and more than, a community of practice. In thinking about this I had to problematise the FIGT as primarily a temporally bound entity; one in which community, if thought of at all, might be considered as inherently ‘disposable’. In such a community members could be recruited and disposed of at the will of the organisation. It would be one where the community is never ours rather it is an outcome of the institutional will
(we have no agency in forming or maintaining the community, or even the suggestion of allegiance).

I think of those with whom I shared this tour as a community of identity where the community came into being through particular interiorising practices (Grimshaw, 2006). These were performances of daily life that worked to unite us as insiders. Community does not require consistent spatial or temporal relations (Brint, 2001) however the coach represented a space in which we could, over time, manage "those contacts and dealings which we [had] with one another in the course of our daily lives, and which form the context of our immediate social circle" (Day, 2006, pg. xx). As Giddens (1991) suggests, collectives happen over/through space and time. Likewise the idea of community rests on who is (or is not) relevant (Bauman and May, 2001). Therefore, before I begin my discussion of the specifics of the group and the performance of everyday life, I want to introduce the individuals who, over time, would become significant others for me both as fellow passengers, but also as individuals within a community with stories to tell.

5.5.1 Naming the group

The discussion in this thesis draws heavily on my encounters, naturally occurring conversations, observations and interactions over a period of time with (in) a defined group of people. My knowledge of the particulars, or demographics, of my fellow passengers, developed over the length of the tour. Given the nature of conversation, the manner and substance of 'hard' demographic data is substantially different to that to be gained from formally completed questionnaires. Moreover, to formally ask the specific questions required would have had a negative impact upon my role as complete member researcher within the group (Adler and Adler, 1987). As such, personal information

---

25 Obviously we encountered and interacted with 'others' outside of this group, however the actors in those situations are considered as distinct to the group. I discuss this further in the following chapter on 'disruptions'.
about fellow passengers came from encounters and personal conversations over the entire time of the tour\textsuperscript{26}. Given that we were all strangers – initially to each other in the tour, but also as tourists (Rumford, 2013), banal talk, for example about the present situation or our past was a way of getting to know each other. However, given the informality and dialogic nature of such conversations some (demographic) topics like our careers were not included in initial conversations\textsuperscript{27}. Likewise age was not a subject that I felt I could address directly or that could became clear through direct questioning due to the need to perform to standards of (social) politeness I felt were required of me (Williams and Nussbaum, 2001, Giles et al., 2003). Rather age (or more particularly age range(s)) became apparent tangentially, gleaned over time through more general discussions. Obtaining data in this way both allowed me to engage in group formation as a working member, but also to unearth personal information that would possibly have not been forthcoming if attempted if a more formal, less sensitive, less dynamic method had been employed (Maddison and Shaw, 2007).

The group (community in becoming) comprised a total of 38 people. This included myself, the tour director and coach driver\textsuperscript{28}. Within the group there were 16 couples. In the context of this thesis, couples were considered individuals traveling together with a significant other. Of the couples, two consisted of pairs of friends travelling together, whilst the remaining couples were in married or de-facto relationships. Myself and three other passengers were travelling as singles\textsuperscript{29}.

\textsuperscript{26} Further personal information was forthcoming in emails between myself and fellow passengers after the conclusion of the tour.

\textsuperscript{27} Although interestingly and somewhat paradoxically (at the time) more personal details were shared shortly before the group split up – see chapter seven for a more detailed discussion.

\textsuperscript{28} The tour director and coach driver were essential to the performance of the group, but operated on the periphery. In saying that my encounters and relations with the tour director challenged my performance as community member – something I discuss further in chapter 7.

\textsuperscript{29} Whilst the term single is itself problematic, I am using it here in the context that the organisation uses when selling the tour package to individual tourists. In this case a single is an individual who is subject to a supplement or surcharge, unless a fellow passenger can be found that will not only sit beside one on the coach, but also ‘share’ accommodation facilities.
Nationality and citizenship was self-defined through on-going conversation, and remained open to negotiation. Of course citizenship, nationality and ethnicity are entangled in identity politics (Miller, 2000). This is important as discussions of ethnicity and country of birth and current place of domicile all went to make up the discourse surrounding ‘home’ that was at the centre of many of our conversations when getting to know each other (Baydar, 2012). More than 50% of passengers came from Australia, with others coming from the United States of America and Canada, with New Zealand and England represented by one passenger each. Occupations ranged from senior university academics through to agricultural workers with no single occupation or work status dominating. The group was fairly evenly split between employed and retired members.

Within this tour, excluding the couples, we were all strangers to each other. No one individual or couple had knowingly encountered or interacted with any of the others. That being said, it was not possible to determine if any of us had interacted with others virtually through the tour company’s web based consumer forum.

Importantly, when thinking about community in the context of shared practice, only three members of the tour group had not previously participated in a fully inclusive package tour. This included myself, and the two youngest members of the group (Emma and Lucy) – who were backpacking together around Europe and had chosen a FIGT as a way of maintaining mobility and (safely) visiting Turkey within their extended European itinerary (discussed further in chapter seven). Most of the remainder of the group were on a one-off tour, where they had left home with the express purposes of engaging in this

---

30 This is an example of demographic data obtained at the end of the tour. The person in question hadn’t wanted to ‘disrupt’ my research.
31 In this thesis I consider the concept of ‘housewife’ as work MASSEY, D. & JESS, P. 1995. A place in the world?: places, cultures and globalization, Oxford University Press in association with the Open University.
particular tour – and intended returning within one or two days of the conclusion of the tour. One couple had engaged in a tour immediately previous to this one, and one couple intended to undertake another tour prior to returning home (see Table 5.1 below).
### Dramatis Personæ (The Players in the Tour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M Connor</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>MD/Consultant</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F Damaris</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F Alana</td>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Shared a Seat with #31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F Wendy</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M Ron</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F Courtney</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M Bill</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>TAFE Lecturer</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F Vera</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Shop Assistant</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Shared a seat with #37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F Sandra</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F Valda</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Scottish/Cana</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F Rosa</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M Evan</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td>Birthday during Trip/Danced!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M Tran</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>HK/Australian</td>
<td>Medical Doctor</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F Amy</td>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>HK/Australian</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M John</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>State Police</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F Shelly</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M Alan</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>F Agatha</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M Stuart</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F Janet</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M Steven</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age/Range</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Beryl</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Fed Police/UN</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Medical Doctor</td>
<td>Time Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Lawyer/Medical Doctor</td>
<td>Time Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Evangelical Minister</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Asia/USA</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>University Academic</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>Greek/Australian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>IT Marketing</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tolga (Tour Director)</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Guide/Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Researcher/Lecturer</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hussain (Driver)</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Members of the Group
5.6 Mobilising this community

As I boarded the coach for the first time, it became (very) real. Whilst I had actively used representations of it in constructing a particular tourist imaginary, it was now manifested as a physical reality. The coach worked as a space of realisation – where we as individuals appeared, at least on the surface (Goffman, 1973), to move seamlessly from performing the roles of mother, father, researcher, lawyer or doctor to that of the touring ‘other’. However, in thinking about these transitions and the spaces in which they occurred from a micro-social perspective, I could begin to understand the complexity of the relations and skills required to enact these nascent identity practices. Of course I could climb the steps of the coach, but it was the social (liminal) space in which we went from becoming to being the tourist that became the challenge.

If one is to think of the possibility that time might afford to the creation of affinities if not community, then the coach became a space for the construction of a situated knowledge (Haraway, 1988), where I could recognise the coach and its inhabitants, both human and non-human as active agents. As such, I wanted to understand the coach as more than the structural idea pre-configured through my tourist imaginary; more even that its physical manifestation as a material reality. Here I would suggest there was a transgression of the space(s) (and traces) of those who have gone before. On moving on board the coach I was, as a consumer, appropriating space. I was not only aware of the transition of space but also that of role transition – for me it was the tension between my researcher self and tourist self, where my previous knowledge of tourism was making me aware of a disruptive internal dialogue, challenging my own ontological security.

My daily life was undergoing a kind of affective rupture. My imagination, and the construction of an imaginary, was the only source of information I had about what was to happen. Furthermore, conflicted between the tourist imaginary that the organisation
wanted ‘me’ to focus upon, and the ‘I’ who to be frank, was petrified\(^{32}\) – a combination of researcher nerves and being a solo traveller in a group. Whilst I was used to performing in the hotel (see chapter one), I was uncertain what the coach was to bring. I wanted to both be a part of the possibility of a new community, whilst simultaneously looking for a way to remain cocooned by aspects of the community (and communities) I was leaving behind.

As participants in a FIGT we were bound to each other through our effect of proximity and shared humanity (Blackshaw, 2010). A coach tour is, fundamentally, about being in the company of others, who are, at least initially, strangers (White and White, 2009; 2008). That being said, in the case of the tour, there was a kind of mutuality of recognition – we are all in this together as outsiders in a strange, but somehow familiar place.

One particular performance worked to interiorise ‘us’ as a group, as well as symbolically marking the forthcoming mobilising of the group, that of *touching luggage* (see plate 5.1). This particular performance was about physically touching ones luggage in front of the tour director, ostensibly to claim ownership, ensuring nothing was left behind. Whilst initially novel, for some of us, this soon became routine and thus mundane behaviour. However, it was only in thinking about what meanings this performance held that I was able to begin to sensitise myself to the minutiae and social intricacies of the tour to come. Whilst on the surface it was about ensuring ones stuff was loaded onto the coach; it also acted as a boarding pass; a symbolic claim to group or community, and a drill – where there was control exerted by the organisation to give order to daily life.

\(^{32}\) There is a Scandinavian word that rather nicely expresses what I was feeling - *reseber* (LÖFGREN, O. 2008b. The Secret Lives of Tourists: Delays, Disappointments and Daydreams. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 8, 85-101, LÖFGREN, O. 2008a. Motion and Emotion: Learning to be a Railway Traveller. *Mobilities*, 3, 331-351, or the idea of a type of travel ‘fever’, tension and disquiet – almost a kind of affective un-wanted embodied mobility. For me this was brought about not just by my upcoming role of tourist and having to ‘socialise’, but also the performance of my researcher self – interacting in order to gain trust.
As suggested in the following excerpt from my journal, the coach, as a space of interaction, can be thought of as a symbolic space (Aase, 1994, Lister, 2013); it has a material reality and is a space of proximity:

I climbed on board the coach. There seemed to be a few people rushing for seats – as individuals. For some reason, I’m waiting. Manners? That most ‘seem’ older than me? That I reason it is what I should do? I feel the gaze of others around me...not sure about my tourist self, but they are certainly bringing my researcher self into existence.

The social construction of the coach was an outcome of the socio-spatial relations of individuals acting in multiple guises; for example as the modern consuming individual, or as an individual acting as part of a civil society (waiting until all the others had been seated). It was a part of communitas-in-becoming (see section 5.9) a social coming together where space creates and is created through situated interactions (Goffman,
1967, 2002). These were the beginnings of the social processes involved in role transition, in addition to the initial (re)configuring of everyday life on tour. After all, as Moran (2005, pg. 19) reminds us “lived, social space is inextricably linked to represented, imagined space, and that both are central to an understanding of everyday life”; it is to the idea of the coach as lived social space that I now want to turn.

5.7 Socialising a community

The processes of encounter and those initial interactions between individuals on the tour encouraged me to think about the tour group being formed through processes of cultural reproduction. The group became a situated reality through the production and reproduction of specific knowledge(s).

At the outset of the tour, the knowledge(s) of this group could be considered as arbitrary. Outside of the idea of the touring collective or group represented in the brochure and the subsequent mediation of an imaginary there was, for me as a neophyte mass tourist (as well as researcher), no prescribed way of being or performing as a member of this particular tour group. Rules were established during the development of the community, and the subsequent work involved in the maintenance of community happened over time. In the context of this FIGT, knowledge was transmitted through the processes of socialisation, those initial encounters that occurred with most impetus over the first two days, but continued throughout the duration of the tour.

The spaces of encounter in the FIGT are different to other forms of travel where individuals are considered to be in proximity for an extended period of time, for example cruise ships (Yarnal and Kerstetter, 2005, Weaver, 2005b, Weaver, 2005a) or for those who purchase and consume fully inclusive package holidays (Andrews, 2011, Andrews, 2006, Andrews, 2005), or fully inclusive resorts selling accommodation in weekly packages (Sheller, 2009). Rather, the actor on the coach tour exists in what might be
considered an intimate\textsuperscript{33} proximity. Unlike the cruise ship, hotel or resort, in the group tour the ‘perfect’ consuming individual (Featherstone, 1987) is brought face to face with the social realities of having to remediate the intimacies (and niceties) of social, everyday life that were to occur in close proximity over an extended period of time. Thus, processes of socialisation take on a renewed immediacy and importance.

The coach, as a constrained public space (Massey, 1992), established a common ground, a site of “dialogic and dialectical practices” (Irazábal, 2008, pg. 24). As such, it had influence and was in turn influenced by sociability or conflict which in turn mediated my and others membership of the community.

5.8 Performing role transitions

In this section I deal in detail with a particular encounter between myself and others on the coach that was to have a significant impact on my place within the community, my practice of everyday life, as well as future role transitions. An outcome of this event was my understanding of the coach as a dialectic space – a space of both being together and being apart. In particular I want to look at how my attempt at performing an everyday role other-than-tourist acted to problematise both my own self-identity as well as the collective identity of a community in the making.

5.8.1 Performing roles – Researcher vs. Tourist vs. Group member

An important part of being on a FIGT is in understanding and coming to terms with what one is being socialised into. A key process is acquiring the skills needed to perform not

\textsuperscript{33} In the context of this thesis I follow Ritchie and Hudson’s RITCHIE, J. R. B. & HUDSON, S. 2009. Understanding and meeting the challenges of consumer/tourist experience research. \textit{International Journal of Tourism Research}, 11, 111-126. discussion of intimacy as having four defining characteristics: physical involving bodily (and embodied) contact; verbal which includes dialogue; spiritual or the sharing of beliefs and finally, intellectual intimacy involving the sharing of ones ‘reflections’ and disclosure of ones ‘knowledge’.
only within the group, but also for being on tour. Important to this achievement was moving from an imagined performance to negotiating the realities of the role(s) one must play. This included questioning identity and where I might ‘fit’ within the tour group and subsequent my place in the (nascent) community (Brunt, 2007).

Up until the date of departure of the tour my I had a twin focus – performing the role of researcher in the process of planning field work, and becoming aware of my performance of tourist self-in-becoming from constructing the tourist imaginary. The self-acknowledgement of the roles I would play meant that, to all intents and purposes, my performance of researcher had come to dominate my daily life over the months leading up to joining the tour. However in saying that, in the world of the ethnographer “the personal/emotional and the theoretical cannot be easily separated from each other nor from the entire cognitive/intellectual process” (Galani-Moutafi, 2000, pg. 215). However, in practice I needed to take into account the complexities of my performance of researcher-as-tourist (Baydar, 2012). As such I found myself, on reflection, having to deal with Crang’s (2011, pg 205) proposition that “it is not uninformative conceit to play with the scandalous suggestion that the ethnographer and tourist are, if not the same creature then the same species and are part of the same continuum”.

Research strategies had been developed, imagination(s) engaged, performances practiced and contingencies planned for. The space(s) of research and travel that I (socially) constructed and in which I performed necessitated a return to researcher reflexivity. Not only the university, as a place of work, but also the spaces and places I had transited (for example airports and hotels) on the way to the field were known and as such, taken-for-granted and performed unreflexively (Baydar, 2012). It was the realities of joining a tour and becoming part of a mobile community that had brought this into sharp relief. My fieldwork took place in what was, after all, a commercial group tour; I was, to the organisation at least, merely one more passenger, as I had been reminded when being granted access. However, and importantly, I needed to query the
relations between myself (as researcher, as tourist, as New Zealander), and those with whom I would co-construct and share space.

The initial stage of the tour certainly gave rise to a continuity and discontinuity of the self. Here tourism was indeed perceived, by me, as exotic and out of the ordinary. The very absence of the banal brought its function into focus. My ability to perform a habitual and disciplined daily life (Pritchard and Morgan, 2000, Foucault, 1977) was challenged by uncertainty about my identity. Of course the everyday identities one performs are continually (re)negotiated, however as the group had not formed there were no active unthinking/uncritical roles I thought I could fall back on. The initial performance of the tour had brought the supposed stability of my everyday cohesive identity/ies into question (Jamal and Hill, 2002). A strategy to deal with this tension was, at the first opportunity, to fall back into comfortable, unreflexive role performances, in this case one that I had brought with me from home, namely that of lecturer.

In the early stages of the tour I had little reservation in performing this role. After all, I consider(ed) myself part of a liquid modern world (Bauman, 2000, Pollock, 2007b), where I am willingly or not, the consuming individual. As such, the tour initially appeared to me as reflecting Tönnies (2001) idea of gesellschaft. When considered a loose association, the tour was at the outset more about facilitating a particular form of travel. It appeared as if the initial focus of (me as) the individual was upon the materiality of the coach as transport, and the tour guide as cultural facilitator rather than on understanding the socio-spatialisation of the coach and those encounters and interactions that would lead to a community on the road.

Given that, for me, the group tour was an extra-ordinary event, it was a social space that required me to (re)learn the skills needed to facilitate my performance of particular roles. Not only that of passenger, but also in the case of the group tour, the skills required to co-exist in close proximity to others for an extended period of time. Of course I have
learnt to co-exist, if somewhat tenuously in the crowded, (un)social and often uncivil spaces of the train and bus of my daily commute (Smith et al., 2010b). However, the space of the coach and the practice(s) of the group tour reminded me of Goffman’s (1971a, pg. 293) suggestion that many of the banalities of everyday life are learned practices. After all;

To walk, to cross a road, to utter a complete sentence, to wear long pants, to tie one’s shoes, to add a column of figures – all these routines that allow the individual unthinking, competent performances were attained through an acquisition process whose early stages were acquired in a cold sweat.

5.8.2 Co-performing the coach

The following vignette is taken from notes made during the first full day of the tour. As such they present an opportunity to illustrate, analyse and discuss a particular crisis of identity, at a stage where the performances of everyday life-to-come had yet to render our daily life on board the coach as ordinary.

We left the ferry about 45 minutes ago, one stop ‘til the hotel – great, I’m tired and hungry. Sensory overload is starting to get the better of me. Tolga (TD) tells us (not I) we will (all) be stopping at St Sophia church and he will give us 30 minutes to have a look around. I’m not particularly interested in looking at another church – after all they are just more ruins. Besides I have another 50 essays to mark! We judder to a stop, the beginnings of the (rituals, routines, habits) of getting off the bus are beginning to appear. Passengers begin to fidget – noise increases – bodies begin to move -Bus stops – engine off –silence of a kind. Tolga gives instructions (I thought we were in charge - naive?) – The skills needed to successfully disembark the bus begin to be learnt (especially by us newbies). Bodies’ stand, appropriate spaces (the aisle), turn 90 – 180 degrees - collect daypack/cameral/tools of the tourist – partners are permitted to enter out into the aisle – spaces overlap, bodies touch (from the
sequestered nature of the joint seats side-by-side). Politeness and civility of a past age is performed. “After you, no you go first; no I insist” (reminds me of Fox’s book 'Watching the English'). Finally, after what seems an eternity, but is in fact 7 1/2 minutes later, I am left alone on the bus. Hussein, the driver notices – he tries to communicate (this is the first time I have interacted with him), no English, but his meaning is clear – I should get off the bus and look at the ruins – I am clearly disrupting the tightly scripted and no less choreographed (as I have just seen) experience. Somehow I make it clear I’m not getting off – thumbs up – universal language.

The importance of understanding the coach as a taskscape became apparent. As both researcher and tourist, I needed to engage with and understand the embodied practices implicit in the construction of the coach as a social space and more importantly, that we engaged in to make community (Ingold, 2004, Bissell, 2009a). As such, the coach became a space where I started to become (re)sensitised to the creative work associated with my being-in-the-world. Here the taken-for-granted if problematic work of everyday commuting (and the ill-manners that often goes with it) was replaced by the ‘dance’ with the stranger. It was different to those mobilities of the daily commute that “are enmeshed with the familiar worlds we inhabit”, and are consequently “part of the unreflexive, habitual practice of everyday life” (Binnie et al., 2007, pg. 165). Rather the coach, whilst remaining ‘familiar’, became a space of tentative action, where actors felt out (sometimes literally) each other. Whilst the kinaesthetic skills of commuting are remembered, a practice of social etiquette of everyday life, these choreographies needed to be re-scripted as we were all new to this particular mobile community. For me this began to problematise, at a micro-social level, the suggestion of tourist praxis as a “distinct ‘common-sense’, unreflexive ways of being” (Edensor, 2001, pg. 60).

Initially at least, our individual construction and performance of space on the coach could be likened to a microcosm of (if not metaphor for) the modern city; where
strangeness to and for each other is made apparent, not by overt shows of exclusion or the like, rather by what appears to be an opening up to, and acknowledgement of the “hybridity and instability of our own identities” (Binnie, 2006, pg. 77). On the coach, through the realisation of the imaginary, we (our-selves) were rendered uncertain. The mundane performances of (what had previously been) everyday encounters with strangers where “little is said between the unacquainted, even though they are involved in making queues together, holding open doors for one another and sharing seats” (Laurier & Philo, 2006, pg. 193) was replaced by proximal intimacies that were to become part of the (embodied) materiality of the coach. In hindsight we might even have been considered to be playing out, on the surface at least, those ‘virtues’ suggested by Donald (1999, pg. 170) required, when encountering strangers: “politeness as well as politics, civility as well as citizenship, the stoicism of urbanity, the creative openness of cosmopolitanism”.

The movements and practices associated with dis/embarking the coach correspond to Vannini’s (2012, pg. 163) assertion that the construction of mobile spaces is about the passengers “practical and creative engagement with their surroundings, and in particular their effective use of techniques necessary”. These, at least initially thoughtful, actions were enacted in order to perform what would, over time, become mundane activities. However, these performances also acted towards the process of socialisation. Here was the practice of civility; of letting others go first, helping one another with putting bags up and getting bags down from overhead racks. As such, the poesis and kinesis of daily life-on-board were brought into play through tourist’s individual and intersubjective construction and negotiation of the coach as a social space.

In waiting to disembark the coach particular sensualities were rendered visible – yawing and stretching, touching objects and each other. Rather than the supposedly sedentary bodies of the mobile tourist (Bissell, 2008), the coach became a space of encounter and intimate interaction. Choreographed politeness allowed us to deal with the affect of the
“fleshy and sensuous bodies” of others on the coach (Haldrup et al., 2006, pg. 176). The ‘dance’ when negotiating space in the aisle was about the agency of performance (Brickell, 2005, Phillips, 2005). Here a sensuousness of engagement (Crouch, 2006) came into play, where we actively (and civilly) choreographed the crossing of embodied boundaries; coming eye to eye, smelling others bodies as well as embodied scents through (unwelcome) breaths; bodies coming into contact - bodies touching bodies.

The stop discussed above was among the first sanctioned disruptions (see chapter six for a further discussion of disruptions and ruptures) to the movement of the tour, and thus became a space of tentative and exploratory action. As I have stated earlier (see chapter four), a function of the brochure was to construct an imaginary where those with whom I would share space (and experiences) would be like-me. However at this stage, and in reality, we didn’t know each other. Discussions had in the main been confined to hesitant small-talk with those in close proximity (Goffman, 1963a) – to the right or left or in front and behind. However, as had become apparent, I needed to come to terms with subjugating my researcher-self. On reflection I understood this as the identity politics (Calhoun, 1994) at play in the formation of the group and how, in order to be in the group, I had to fully perform as a group member.

Rather than a performing a ‘dominant’ identity, role transition is one that must be performed and understood as contingent. I needed to move between community member and researcher whilst somehow continuously performing the reflexive self. In order to do so there was the need to interrupt my own conversation (and reflexive internal dialogue) as community member with observations and analysis as researcher (Conquergood, 2006). This began the internal negotiation between me as group member and my role as producing a reflexive ethnography. This was a beginning I like to think of a more, rather than less, reflexive individual; one where the ‘I’ of being researcher transitions between interlocutor and being the ‘me’ as active participant of the group tour.
5.8.3 Crisis of identity

I use the following journal extract to explore the non-performance of my tourist-self.

...Monday: stayed on the bus as St Sophia Church – my not getting off created quite a bit of interest by the others. I was marking assignments – depressing again! However it seemed that by standing out as an individual encouraged others to interact with me... (this was both positive and negative – drew attention – talked about research, became so overt that it became covert...) Meetings and encounters with my fellow passengers – were we in fact constructing the other in the intersubjective performance (i.e. both ‘us’ as the ‘other’ and the ‘other’ as ‘other’?!) What about the investments we made (what are they and what is the outcome ...what do we hold back, how might time mediate these investments) Me especially, what do I disclose?? How do I distinguish between the professional and the personal? After all I feel I have an ethical obligation to disclose what I am doing, but how do I negotiate the private self, my-self as a touring subject rather than academic/researching object (do the others interpret me as an outsider/object)?

There was a veneer of coherence in the initial performance of the tour. However there is, always, near the surface the possibility of rupture, the possibility of disorder (Smith et al., 2010b). More than being ‘just’ an imaginary I had assumed that in reality the group would pre-exist, possibly due to my own initial, uncritical reading of the tour brochure. I had bought into the institutional representations of the group tour. However, as Anderson (2006, pg. 381) rightly notes, “group members seldom exhibit a uniform set of beliefs, values, and levels of commitment”. That being said, my performance of staying on the coach was both misplaced (and rather than working on placing it worked to de-place the coach), and mis-performed. I had not taken into account how my explicit performance of role difference would challenge role expectations, those performances expected of me by those others on the tour (Anderson, 2006).
My researcher-self had been focused on obtaining first order analysis, the initial surface observations, to the neglect of thinking about how I might access the deeper meanings and knowledge(s) to be gained from second order analysis (Darlington and Scott, 2002). There was a tension between my need to perform as a tourist on holiday, in effect placing the complete member against my role as a legitimate researcher. This was made apparent when attempting to perform the work of marking assignments. I was attempting (subconsciously) to perform at what might be considered a Brechtian distance; placing myself apart from the group – situating myself as audience to their touristic performances. I thought that not participating in the activities of the group when off the coach would give me time to play a different role. Whilst I recognised the field of enquiry (the coach) as mobile, I neglected the (im)mobilities of the subject. I was privileging the coach as Cartesian space over the embodied and affective mobilities of the subject. To all intents and purposes I was self-alienating, not only physically but also importantly emotionally (Reinelt and Roach, 2007, Carney, 2005). In doing so I had removed myself from the possibilities of knowing the affective construction of community through the performances of daily life off as well as on the coach.

On reflection, this performance was marked (for me) as a point of change. I came to realise that in order to be of part of the group I needed to participate fully with (and within) the group (Pink, 2009). It was a ‘feeling’ (affect) that in order to become further involved in the everyday life on tour of fellow research participants, I needed to participate in activities outside of what I initially saw as my research area. In effect that meant that I had to physically engage in touristic performances, such as sightseeing at the site/sights that made up much of the itinerary. Up to this point I had planned to participate, but that participation would be when I decided. By remaining on the coach I was trying to maintain my own everyday life, facilitated by technologies, such as a laptop, that I had brought with me on tour. Here my ‘working’ on the bus (rather than ‘working’ at the tour) had acted to disrupt both the formation of the group, as well as my participation as a full member within the group. My trying to differentiate, manage and
indeed privilege my own individual identities within the close proximities of the bus thus placed the tour as merely a collection of individuals rather than the possibility of a group (if not a community) of similarly motivated social actors. By breaking the unwritten rules associated with the tour group (visiting sites), I was situating myself as deviant – outside of the group (Becker, 1963). As a result, the ability to perform an everyday (working on the move) of my own choosing was problematized. In order to become part of the group I could no longer differentiate, through overt public performance, my plural selves.

Even though I have travelled extensively, it was almost as if I suddenly became aware that to be a tourist, one needs to work at being-a-tourist, and moreover, was I up to this work? However, I was reminded of C.S Lewis 34 who so succinctly put it in The Inner Ring; “until you conquer the fear of being an outsider, an outsider you will remain”. As a researcher, this discourse was a manifestation of my fear of being an outsider in the group. This contested my need to perform the role of researcher as group member. It was only after the fact that I began to (consciously) engage my reflexive self, and recognise that I had been performing as an unreflexive naïve researcher. My engagement in performance as monologue (marking and remaining separate) was an attempt to “once again, [make] the error of reinforcing the status of the researcher as the more authoritative speaker” (Lawless, 1992, pg. 302). Thus in this one seemingly banal experience – not getting off a coach – I was brought face to face with the realities of fieldwork.

Somewhat paradoxically, the deviant performance of my working self enabled me to fulfil institutional ethical requirements. Thus the questions regarding what I was doing allowed me to disclose my research as part of the wider dialogic performance of community forming. Of course there was a blurring between my-self as researcher and

34 Presented by C. S. Lewis at the memorial lecture at King’s College, London 1944 (www.lewissociety.org/innerring.php)
lecturer-marking self. However, my objective as a (post-graduate) researcher became a point of discussion. It enabled me to broach the subject of institutional ethics in a way that was not disruptive (as my performance had already disrupted). For me, this particular act of consciously and publicly rejecting and not performing the tourist-self marked the beginnings of a necessary change in my research(er) practice. In order to achieve what I had set out to do, I had to divert from the pre-planned script that I had prepared at home, and embrace what Sarah Pink (2009), suggests as the possibilities of inhabiting (embracing and embodying) the serendipitous sensory leanings of being there in the actual field. For me, in acknowledging and paying regard to the reflexive researcher self, I became attuned to the beginnings of community – where in turn I felt I was almost apprenticed to those more experienced members of the group.

5.9 Communitas

My focus in this chapter is on the formation of community – important to this is how we came to perform what might be considered communitas. The idea and performance of communitas is not the focus of this thesis. However, in saying that, I feel it important to briefly discuss what I understand communitas to be and explain why it was a key factor in negotiating social change amongst us, as individuals. This is important as it resulted in the formation of a meaningful social collective that became the community. Moreover, the processes involved in communitas can be used to explore what those performances and spaces that changed us such as the ordering and re-ordering of our daily lives.

Spontaneous or existential communitas, as I discuss further below, is that sense of being with others created through affective encounters, for example in the pre-trip cocktail welcome and our initial encounters on the coach. Here, it can be suggested, the participants on the tour “became totally absorbed into a single synchronised, fluid event” (Turner 1982, pg. 48). The materiality of the coach, our bodies relationship with the coach and those around us were inherently linked in the (co)construction of the coach as
a social space (Lugosi, 2007). Fundamentally, thinking about ‘communitas’, is understanding “the ways in which humans relate to one another” (Foster and McCabe, 2014, pg. 3).

When one is part of spontaneous communitas, as Turner (1982, p. 48) argues, a high value is placed on personal honesty, openness, and lack of pretensions or pretentiousness. We feel that it is important to relate directly to another person as he (sic) presents himself in the here-and-now, to understand him in a sympathetic way, free from the culturally defined encumbrances of his role, status, reputation, class, caste, sex, or other structural niche. Yet, Turner also recognises that spontaneous communitas may be short-lived, giving way to normative communitas as the group developed, through ritual performances, norm governed behaviours and practices. It is such rituals that came to provide structure and continuity to our lives on tour. A structure that, through the sharing of rituals, came to define our community (Bial, 2004,).

Important here is the status of the ritual subject - whereby the sharing of ritualized performances can lead to feelings of communitas (Sharpe, 2005). Moreover although “virtually all performances contain some ritualized behavior, ritual itself is a particular type of performance. It emphasises efficacy over entertainment, adherence to tradition over technical virtuosity. Ritual has ‘real’ consequences” (Gabler, 2004, pg. 77). The rituals on tour invoke the authority of a concept larger than the individual: in our case the mobile community and indeed the tour director as representative of the organisation. Although the coach tour, and especially the coach itself might suggest a freeing of the participants from normal everyday actions and interactions, we were not free to make our own rules, after all the organization had an economic imperative which governed our movement. That being said the coach did, as I discuss below, retain aspects of being a liminal space including the performance of particular localised rituals.

As I boarded the coach for the first time I progressed through a liminal phase, as Turner (Turner, 2004, pg. 80) would suggest, I crossed a threshold "where my [own] behavior
was passive and humble” (see section 5.6). Communitas, as suggested above, results in an unquestioned belonging, however each time we rejoined the coach, for example after a night in a hotel (where the hotel was a space that offered opportunities to leave the community), we needed to perform particular rituals – the questioning from the tour director as to the quality of our hotel. Although the coach tour, and especially the coach, might suggest a space that frees participants from normal everyday actions and interactions, a number of acts that became part of the banal, but ritualised background to the touristic experience worked to construct and (re)construct communitas. I have talked previously of our touching our suitcases or backpacks in front of the tour director prior to boarding the coach (see for example image 5.1). It was through a ritualization of such daily rhythms that a normative communitas emerged. Likewise, in washing our hands with lemon scented alcohol the tour director, through a highly embodied and affective ritualised performance, enabled us once again to establish our membership of the tour as a normative communitas.

In the initial stages of the tour, the ‘group’ might be considered existing as liminoid communitas (Wilkinson, 2007). What I am suggesting here is that liminoid space exists outside of the everyday life of the communities in which we, as passengers, lived (Turner, 1982). Moreover, the coach was different (at least on the surface) to our ‘home(s)’, both spatially and initially in terms of performance (Selänniemi, 2001).

Liminoid communitas allowed us, in the initial stages of the tour, to engage in the proximal performance of the intimacies of everyday life whilst in the process of becoming a group. Our encounters with bodies and things and the resultant social relations worked to produce a distinct type of communitas (Turner, 1969). Even as strangers we recognised a shared identity as tourists-in-becoming, already, to some extent, familiar to each other. Through an “affectual bonding created through direct interaction” (Lugosi, 2007, pg. 166) social encounters and interactions mediated the construction of a community of strangers (Wilken, 2010). The very nature of our
interactions and encounters being confined as they were to a temporally bound space, suggests these encounters as (generally) “always unique and hence socially transient” (Turner, 1969, pg. 128). Thus communitas is suggested as a spontaneous outcome. In (re)negotiating (my) identity, conditions of liquid modernity were challenged and where subsequently, “[n]otions of individualism and individual identity [were] abandoned and replaced by a sense of collective being” (Lugosi, 2007, pg. 166).

5.9.1 The consuming community

The coach (inclusive) tour has been suggested as a type of enclavic space (Tucker, 2007), which necessarily restricts individual agency in order to fulfil the requirements of the commercially consuming body. To achieve this, it is suggested the performance of the individual needs to be rigorously controlled and regulated (Edensor, 2000). This is necessary in order for ongoing mediation of the (in this case illusory) tourist imaginary and to ensure the subsequent discursive (re)configuration of the subject as tourist. This control is, in large part, a function (regulation) of the touring itinerary. Thus on the one hand, there is a communitas formed through the social actor’s agency – whilst being simultaneously mediated through a communitas more formally associated with the structural requirements (Turner, 1969) of tourism as economic institution. Thus, early on, rather than being a particularly intersubjective, or somewhat idealised, dialogic community – the coach created an interactive (but not intersubjective) space. The group functioned as what might be more appropriately considered a dialectical community where we as a collective “function[ed] self-referentially” (Rosen, 2008, pg. 242).

If one is to assert methodological individualism then the agency of the social actor can be regarded as dissolving the community through a focusing of attention on the individual. Likewise, in thinking only of the group tour as part of a wider social structure (for example commodified western travel systems) then agency is rendered irrelevant as it is the organisation that shapes the group and community as a social outcome (Connor, 2011). In my mind, the tour community emerged out of both structure and agency. Here then, the community needs be regarded as a “set of interacting actors and as a
configuration of institutionalized parts or complexes that both enable and constrain actors and the games they play with each other” (Archer, 1996, pg. 314 my italics).

If considering structure and agency as a dualism (Archer, 1996, Archer, 2003) one can recognise the construction of community as influenced by time. Although the institutional, and thus structural constitution of the community occurred in advance (the imaginary), and even though elements of the structural remained, the agential characteristics or the spontaneity of communitas happened in-situ. However, to an extent, any possible agency of individuals remained, to a greater or lesser extent, managed by the organisation through the deployment of the Tour Director (TD) and the coach driver; for example when I was encouraged to get off the coach. Thus there is an interdependence of structure and agency; the production and reproduction of the community is mediated by interactions between agents and the wider tourism system as institution.

I want to also stress, that for me, when I talk of our group as community I am in particular thinking of the acts and performance that went towards a symbolic construction of community – in effect the formation of a community through the construction of boundaries (performance of the tourist self – sight-seeing). As such I was seeing the community as a symbolic order rather than essentially an objective reality (Delanty, 2010). Such performances included, for example, getting up out of our seats along with the interactions on getting back on the coach. Furthermore, these mobile encounters worked as a kind of triangulation. Whyte (1980) talks of how particular circumstances involving both material and non-material social objects, interactions and space can work to facilitate the dialogic interaction of individuals. In effect, we as individuals made use of external stimuli, a third element, for example through performing social niceties and helping each other. These performances affectively mediated interactional encounters, relations between us and subsequently, formation of community.
In forming the community, performances were scripted by manners and etiquette and were common to those performances where we might encounter strangers in public (Goffman, 1971b). However, certain performances, including movements to get off the coach were engaging us in new and intimate encounters that became, over time, banal interactions (Löfgren, 2008a). Here the minutiae of encounters in everyday life (in public) moved from ordinary to extraordinary and back to ordinary.

5.10 Everyday life – performing a mobile community

Understanding passengering is, for me important – as I consider “we are passengers at all times, constantly betwixt and between old arrivals and new departures, and the very comings and goings of others around us” (Vannini, 2012, pg. 80). In the context of this thesis, passengering worked to mediate how I felt about the spaces and places I inhabited – in this case the coach. Everyday life became about the learning of skills (and observing those displayed by others) of passengering.

Being on the coach was different to the passengering one performs during the mundane mobilities that form part of the daily commute (Binnie et al., 2007, Edensor, 2007). To all intents and purposes, we had limited ‘escape’ from each other. Some, including myself, might bemoan the two-hour commute and the incivilities incurred in close proximity to one’s fellow passengers (Smith et al., 2010b). However, on the coach we were sharing body space for extended periods of time – some seven or eight hours per day (not including time spent together at meals or walking around tourist sites/sights). Initially, we could have been considered as performing an intratourist gaze – placing us as both objects and subjects; which in turn acted to discipline encounters on the coach (Holloway et al., 2011). This worked as a way to socialise those of us who were new to this form of being mobile into the rules and regulations of the mobile-community. This included for example, how one might use ones body.
Before discussing life on the road, and how it both affects and is affected by the banal, I want to briefly place the coach. Although inherently a mobile object, for me the coach can be thought of as placed. It owes its character to the experience it affords to those who spend time there – to the sights, sounds and indeed smells that constitute its specific ambience. And these, in turn, depend on the kind of activities in which the inhabitants engage (Grogan and Richards, 2002. Pg. 192)

The coach was a social object, however the materiality of the coach was important; it was the place in which we spent so much of our ‘wakeful’ (although see below for less than wakeful) day. The coach was the site in which we carried out the practice of much of our everyday life on the road. As such I want to make use of Ingold’s (2004) concept of ‘taskscape’ as a way of articulating my (and others) banal but affective and sensual engagements and encounters.

5.11 Daily life as taskscape

The map at the front of the coach (see the map behind Tolga in plate 6.1) showed us where we would be travelling to, stopping and the activities that we might or might not perform and experience. The itinerary and map thus acted as a codex; where we would be, where we would stay. The itinerary represented a list of acts that, through the organisation, gave structure to our daily life. These included performances that were focused on maintaining comfort, but also those that were of a (overtly) commercial nature – for example stopping to visit potteries and carpet weavers. The itinerary, as a textual document, was constructed in a way that allowed group members to manipulate and importantly meet the expectations of the imaginary. Provided to us prior to the commencement of the tour\textsuperscript{35}, the pamphlet provided details not only of our tour joining

\textsuperscript{35} Whilst others had received the itinerary prior to departing for the tour, I did not receive a copy until the tour was underway. This may have impacted on my feelings of angst and uncertainty in how I was to perform on tour.
instructions, including details on what we should pack (or not pack), but also penalties that would ensue if we did not follow instructions (i.e. being left behind).

The map and itinerary as imaginary (the future day), and material objects worked to manipulate our everyday lives. In effect, and affect, they acted as a script from which we performed the touring day. The language used and the subsequent performances engendered were about constructing the movement of the coach as mundane mobility (Binnie et al., 2007, Edensor and Holloway, 2008). Importantly however, it was about removing agency from us as individuals. The individual had little choice as to when the coach would depart, indeed we were continually reminded of the consequences of 'being late'.

This was an attempt to construct an atmosphere of familiarity in order to minimise possible dis-comfort and to ensure we did not run the risk of becoming bodies out-of-place, either as consumers or importantly as members of a mobile community (we must be 'on-time'). Moreover, the itinerary suggested the possibility of “affective and imaginative connections to other times and places, facilitat[ing] kinaesthetic pleasures, and construct[ing] complex topographies of apprehension and association” (Edensor, 2003, pg. 152)\textsuperscript{36}. Thus, in their own way, these texts were (consciously or not) contributing to not only the structuring of our everyday lives, but also to the construction and maintenance of community through our embodied performance of, and engagement with, the itinerary.

Such achievement(s) occurred through our (un)reflexive involvement with the itinerary as techné (De Certeau, 2002); and our engagement with such technology through skilful endeavour (Silverstone, 1999). Thus, the itinerary was implicated in the mediation of a (necessarily) mundane, everyday life on the coach. However, this was open to

\textsuperscript{36} Something also found in the tour brochure, and discussed in chapter four.
contestation by the opportunities afforded by a “practical and creative engagement with [our] surroundings” (Vannini, 2012, pg. 163) and those with whom we constructed and shared space.

5.11.1 Moving on from familiarity

It is indisputable that over time we came, to a greater or lesser extent, to know each other. This came about as our performances of self were continually brought into question and challenged. To be part of the group, for me, was to continually reflect – how had I/we performed yesterday? And what about the day before? Such reflection, for me as researcher, was to problematise the suggestion that as time goes by, and through necessity, the individual on a group tour is forced to perform some sort of self that is unthinkingly consistent (Seaton, 2002, Hsu, 2003).

I forgot (or wanted to) about the work of performing self (Goffman, 1971a). The work of performing the tourist (Edensor, 2000, Adler, 1989) consumed most of my energies. Here, for example, my engagements with two fellow passengers changed over time. For much of the trip (excluding the day I managed to achieve the backseat), Valda and Sandra were seated directly behind me. Our engagements, which were initially at least intersubjective, revolved around the communication and performance of cultural and social (identity) stereotypes. These were outwardly, but also inwardly self-depreciating, aimed by one-self at one’s own identity. Thus, the performance was played out dramaturgically to my expectations. As such we were complicit in dialogically constructing the selves we expected the other to perform. Our stories of and about self were focused on the veracity of the other's cultural heritage(s). Valda self-identified as being a Scot living in Canada, Sandra as a Canadian with Scottish heritage and my own genealogical heritage as New Zealander of Scottish heritage gave a sense of shared belonging.
Our conversations worked (sub)consciously to re-enforce cultural stereotypes (Kashima, 2000), played out in order to establish a warm friendly environment (McAdams, 1993). Dialogue focused on stories about homelands, accents and shared stereotyping of other cultures. This in turn created bonds through mutual exclusionary practices. Cultural stereotypes became the common trope: Aussies picking light-heartedly on the Kiwi, the Scot and the Kiwi talking about shared heritage, the jokes about the probity of the Scottish (Kashima, 2000). However, over a period of time, these discussions became somewhat tiresome to all of us. Proximity in both a physical and embodied sense, and the requirement (and the tacit acknowledgement) that we would be spending a significant amount of time together came to challenge those social performances that would have been satisfactory for a limited time. Thus, in order for the maintenance of community there was a need to move past the theatrical and staged performances of civility and socialisation to something more profoundly affective.

The process of moving from the formalities associated with a nebulous collective grouping of individuals with (some) shared values to that of a community can be seen through these and similar performances. Social niceties that maintained initial group cohesion, over a limited period of time, became inadequate to the task. The formalities associated with these performances faded as we got to know each other – as we witnessed and shared in each other's performances of banal and mundane practices of everyday life. As such, we grew bored of the very banality of 'polite' structured social interaction with and between strangers. We were no longer strangers, and banal conversations, "those interaction events that are perceived as shallow, superficial, or devoid of meaning" (Baxter and DeGooyer, 2001, pg. 12), were no longer pleasant. The maintenance of community required a new, less tiresome, discourse.

5.11.2 Challenging (im)mobility

Often the coach is thought of as a space of immobility – a space of and for sedentary bodies. As sedentary bodies, rather than the expected corporeally mobile, the body
becomes largely overlooked in the search for tourist knowledge (Bissell, 2008). As such I want, in this section, to look towards understanding the ‘still’ body as part of our daily life on tour.

On the tour a substantial part of the waking day was spent sitting in the coach, and as such is important to understanding both the space and performance of everyday life on tour. By exploring the supposed stillness of the body one can explore the ordinariness of everyday life on tour. The body in transit might be the very essence of the mundaneness of the tourist experience. Here, for example, Tucker (2007) talks of the need for passengers to engage in mindless activities. Such performances Tucker suggests, are carried out in order to detract from the boredoms of transiting by tourist coach between those destinations that are regarded as the motivation to travel on such tours. Whilst “the nature of a sightseeing trip is ‘getting there’” (Haldrup, 2004, pg. 446), the tourist imaginary for this tour had as its focus, for the individual, the image of ‘being there’ (Pearce, 2009, Morgan, 2007). The brochure’s discursive mediation of getting there was predominantly one of comfort. However, attending to the affectual (im)mobilities of the seated body on the coach and looking at travelling between stopping points (discussed in the following chapter) presented opportunities to “open up new spaces and vocabularies with[in] which subjectivity is negotiated” (Bissell, 2008, pg. 1700).

Many who purchase and consume group tours do so in the search for a comfortable form of transport with (hopefully) pleasant company (Boylorn). However, for others the group tour is the last place they would look to when thinking about comfort (Obrador-Pons et al., 2009a). The group tour is often about spending extended periods of time confined to one seat, surrounded by a group of strangers and thus performing a (at least at the outset) public self. For some this can be thought of as the antithesis of comfort – the coach represents a disciplining space (Becken). However, this is to suggest the body as docile, and to neglect possibilities of mobility inherent in stillness and how both “thought and action are inseparable constituents in the emergent materialisation of bodies”
(Bissell, 2011, pg. 2649). Here I want to think about those performances that stood out on the coach during the time we were travelling between stopping points. However, rather than looking to the active, skilful body – for example taking photographs or writing in journals, I want to foreground reflections from the knowing but ‘still’ body. To do so is to mobilise and bring to life spaces and performances of everyday life on the coach.

Rather than, as Larsen (2001, pg. 89) argues, the corporeally mobile body in the car or train being “fully immobilized”, I want to make use of Bissell and Fuller’s (2010) idea of stillness as a way of transcending the dualism of mobility and immobility. In the case of the fully immobile body, stillness is suggested as inherently stable; however stillness is not bereft of rhythms and indeed on the coach might be regarded as on the precipice of instability, and of ultimately challenging the maintenance of community.

5.11.3 Being at home in the midst of others

Given the close proximities of individuals we, as members of a mobile community but also individuals, needed to manage the intimacies of close social interaction in a confined space. In forming a nascent community, solidarity was established that allowed us to deal with our ‘remove’ or relative separation from the world through which we were travelling, as well as the world we had left behind (Vannini, 2012). We were, on the surface at least, affectively insulated but equally isolated from the world through which we travelled. In some ways (through for example emails and Skype) we remained more connected to the world we had left behind than the one that was framed by the coach window, and upon which we gazed.

In plate 5.2 below Vera is, on first sight, performing the tourist. Her gaze is focused on the passing landscape – camera in hand, perhaps ready to take a photograph of a suitable tourist site/sight.
Plate 5.2 Vera performing the tourist?

Seated here Vera, at first glance, was performing the touristic passenger. One who was located at the nexus of mobility and immobility, ‘freedom’ and control, flesh and machine...the axiomatic figure of contemporary mobile life...[prompting] some disquieting questions about the agentive potentialities of stillness in its multiplicity (Bissell and Fuller, 2010, pg. 8).

However, Vera is (and considers herself) an active individual; rather than performing the tourist-as-consumer, the self (pre)configured through the tourist imaginary, Vera was actively crafting travel time (Watts, 2008). When I spoke to Vera, not long after the image was taken, she was startled into awareness. Her first comment to me was that she had been ‘miles away’. What was notable was that her first action was to immediately move into the expected performance of the tourist self by taking a photograph (se plate 5.3). For Vera, her mobility had been, until brought back to the world of the FIGT “unwinding, gentle and easy” (Adey et al., 2012, pg. 11, italics in original). For me, this embodied mobility between sleepiness and wakefulness helped me to “appreciate how
bodies perceive through, are significantly impacted on, and are affected by experiences of mobility” (Bissell, 2009b, pg. 428).

Plate 5.3 Vera performing the tourist!

Stillness can be a space for both continuity and discontinuity of the self. The (comparative) stillness within the coach was mobilised to maintain continuity of self, to bring one back to one’s self after visiting tourist sites and sights. Whilst the organisation worked to remove any of the ambiguity inherent in tourist practice, by making choices and constructing itineraries, the everyday life of the tourist remained to a greater or lesser extent, ambiguous. What to choose for lunch, how much to spend on the Turkish carpet, will the essays ever get marked? Whilst not remarkable, challenges to the banalities of unambiguous everyday life practices-at-home (on the coach) brings into focus the present moment. The coach becomes a time-space where one might become more aware of, and in turn attuned to, one’s internal dialogue (Cunha and Gonçalves, 2009).
The coach, and especially in the context of stillness, somewhat ironically given its utilitarian use, allows a pause in the ‘flow’ of tourism. However, rather than the antithesis of the mobility of the tourist, stillness became a space of both resistance and opportunity. Here the agency of the individual becomes apparent. The still spaces within the coach enabled one to reconfigure self apart from that of the consumer-as-tourist. Thus, one was able to disrupt the tourist imaginary, and to put aside structural disciplining power – if only for the period of transit between tourist sites (Tucker, 2007). As such, stillness on the coach could release one, if only temporarily, from being the ‘prisoner of the passage’ (Adey et al., 2012).

Through stillness dualism is challenged; one becomes the body, situated as a reflexive embodied mechanism attuned to the very minutiae of everyday occurrences on the coach. It is this stillness “that renders the passenger vulnerable to other intensities, other forms of awareness: enlargements that can only take place” on board the tour coach (Adey et al., 2012, pg. 19). Thus Vera, whilst crafting her own coach time, is actively engaged in the reconfiguration of (her)self and others. Here the performative value of the coach allowed Vera to perform a self where “to be human is to exist in the tension between solitude and solidarity” (Archer, 2003, pg. 78).

Rather than moving passively with the coach we were able to, through thinking about the reflexive (and dialogic) capacities of stillness, reclaim subjectivities (Cocker, 2009). Here the ability or agency to act subsequently results in an individual’s capacity/desire to act. Stillness acted to create a particular (truly) embodied mobility. This excerpt from my journal was written after I had taken the photograph of Vera. Similar to Edensor and Holloway (2008), stillness had acted to accentuate other rhythms within and around the coach.
Creaks and rattles of the bus - a manifestation of our corporeal mobility sensed through rhythms – the affects of mobility. Whilst we are still within the bus we are made aware of our mobility (motility?) through much more than the gaze through the frame of the window. Physical mobility is manifest through (along with those creaks and rattles) particular rhythms - the background hum of the engine, the comforting sounds of tires on the road, the rhythmic beat of windscreen wipers and gears changing. Other more embodied mobilities affect both the mind and body. The dull background hum of voices chatting – (the active mind attempting to pick out accents), the flickering of the sun across closed eyelids, the crack of water bottles being opened, the sounds of drinking, people clearing throats, the drifting in and out of sleep. Here there is a kind of languidness to our travel – The very notion of embodied mobility is brought to bear through the sound of my heart beating in my ears – but somehow it is more than this, it is the beat in my ears, both embodied and sensual – I feel my life/heart in my ears. But then I realise it is Tolga as he tap taps his fingers on the microphone, a warning of an upcoming ‘disruption’ to our stillness… the noise level rises, the intimate sounds of fellow passengers awakening, conversations started, heads popping between seats with the offer of a sweet. Arms stretching, filling spaces previously unfilled. Eyes narrow and look to the front – agency is draining away and we are subservient to the map – back to the work of the tourist…

Stillness reveals habitual practices - but it is also stillness that had attuned me to the sounds of potential becoming(s), the click of the microphone as we erupt from our slumber(s) heralding a new sight/site of potential mobility. There was a re-tuning of bodies as we conversed with our neighbour, or shout down the bus, in preparation for the touristic performances to come.

Stillness mediated what might be suggested a collective subjectivity. This collective coming together reinforced communitas through the intersubjectivity brought about by embodied engagement with the sensory space(s) of both body and object. Furthermore,
by investing in sensory engagements with stillness I was constructing emotional attachment(s). The coach became about feeling ‘at home’ and secure. Here it was about strengthening community through (shared) affective relations and about being recognized and understood.

Rather than the ‘submissive’ or even ‘oppressive’ stillness represented (and ordered through community and) by the brochure, the stillness on the coach was a dynamic stillness – one filled with opportunity. At times, I read a newspaper as we travelled along in the coach. In thinking through this, (my) reading a newspaper on the coach might be regarded as the performance of what Goffman (1963a, pg. 39) terms “involvement shields”. Given the inescapable proximity, where the body at least, remains involved in the community one can make use of situations and objects to block (outward) signs of interaction. However for me, rather than attempting to create some form of proximate solitude, I am caught performing home – those routines that I do unthinkingly in my everyday life, catching up with the news from around the world. For me, stillness became a time to perform alternative identities – here, for example, I was performing a routine of home, which, as the research journal excerpt below shows, took on new resonance on tour.

| I’m really missing the news, what’s going on in the world – I’m feeling isolated? We are sometimes catching the end of English news bulletins on the hotel television – English language newspapers have taken on new importance in the community (on the bus) – those who have one (power), they have almost become tradable. Initially I was reticent to ask if I could read Connor’s paper. I wasn’t the only one – however OK once it went to someone else...are we really that disjointed from the/our world?? Do these newspapers work to further isolate us from the exteriorised spaces through which we became and through which we are mobile. BUT is also part of being outside of the world (ones normal world) – we keep in touch but with loved ones (or work!) but not | 203 |
As Vannini (2011) stresses, to be spatially mobile is to work, where those moving are engaged in the negotiation of and through multiple taskscapes, and that these journeys or mobilities are “hard wrought, intersubjective accomplishments” (Vannini, 2011, pg. 1). Thus the spaces and taskscapes that one moves through take on increasing importance.

Undoubtedly the coach is an ambiguous space – and as such is replete with elusive mobilities (Vannini, 2011), including those invoked in the construction of performance(s) and negotiation of encounters between material objects, social actors and space. For me the coach is a site of transformation. It became a space(s) where I could explore those “discourses, sensuous bodies, machines, objects, [humans] and places which are choreographed together and build heterogeneous cultural orders that have the capacity to act, to have effects and affects” (Haldrup and Larsen, 2006a, pg. 278). Moreover, these outcomes happened over time and came to represent “those contacts and dealings we have with one another in the course of our daily lives” (Day, 2006, pg. x). The result of these encounters, I contend, is a specific type of mobile community.

5.12 Summary

I certainly did not want to position the idea of community as some form of (pre)modern idyll – as something that represents all that was good about the past. Rather, the community came into existence through “the interpretive activities of its members, and registered among the concepts which [we] used in everyday talk and interaction” (Day, 2006, pg. 157). Here mundane (personal) performances become the routines and rituals that effectively and affectively bound and bind. Our performances (and mediation of
social and physical space) constructed a situated interiority; both corporeally through the materiality of the coach, including egress points, but also individual and collective agency through our shared, embodied praxis of everyday life in the coach. Certainly for me, this is at odds with the disembodied representation of the imaginary (the masculine subject dominating) of the tourist brochure. Spaces of emotion in turn become similarly performative spaces. Although we were initially strangers, there was an embodied closeness manifest through the (intersubjective) sharing of everyday life with like-minded individuals. Over time, and through the sensuous engagements with the space(s) of everyday coach life, the coach itself can be considered a dialectical spatiality. The im/mobilities inherent on and within the coach worked to affect our daily lives on-board, whilst simultaneously the (re)production and (re)configuration of everyday practices of our mobilised 'home' lives came to affect and modify daily life on board.

Certainly for me, the tour group became a mobile if temporal, community. It was thinking about Donna Haraway’s (1988), suggestion that rather than privilege the individual, one must attend to, and recognise the relevance of community (or affinities) in the construction of situated knowledge that really made me stop and think about the tour group as community. As such it became more than just the individual’s agency but rather (and more importantly) the (im)possibility of a collective agency to affect and be affected by those performances and activities we usually associate with the taken-for-grantedness of home that presented new insights into the touring subject. Passengering becomes, over time, easier. Stillness took on new resonance, we didn't feel the need to engage cognitively with those around us, rather the coach became part of a ‘circuit of habit’, the talk, the inscriptions on the body of the tourist performing (Bissell, 2012a). As a consequence, the displaced body (from home) became emplaced as, over time, the coach became 'home'. Comfortable with, and in the coach, the knowledge of one’s surroundings and the emergence of the stranger as significant other enabled me to realise the efficacy of the touring body. It was much more than the materiality that ‘made’ the coach; more even than the boundaries between those within and those
outside, it was also daily life and the constituent performances as well as the stuff of
daily life that make coach life both possible and bearable. Certainly one’s ability to dwell
on the bus is an accomplishment – it is not something that just happens.

But of course not all the time on tour is spent on the coach. In the following chapter I
want to introduce the disruptions that came to regulate our bodies and mind, those
spaces and times that had us coming into contact and disrupting the body-habits of
home. I like to think of the tour as a multiplicity of arrivals and departure (comings and
goings). But what affect and effect do these comings and goings have on the community
of the tour? Although it might appear that a key focus of the itinerary is to produce and
reproduce the tourist experience – those sites and sights so expected by the consumer-
tourist and promised by ideological discourse – a focus of these disruptions is to
maintain solidarity of the group through the maintenance of the (structurally) regulated
body. In effect the disruptions of the still body somewhat paradoxically work to ensure a
comfortable mind and body. It is to those overlooked performances that disrupt the
mobility of the tour, but give some semblance to daily life away from home that I now
turn.
Chapter Six: **Disruptions and routines of everyday life**

### 6.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I framed the coach as a relational, albeit mobile place (Anderson, 2012). This ‘placeness’ is, in part, due to it being a space of multiple comings together of people, practices and materiality. An outcome of this was a communitas constructed and performed through the active *social* production of the coach. We, as passengers, had worked to construct a cohesive, functional, mobile community. More than merely a mode of transport, the coach can be thought of as a space of micro-social encounters. The previous chapter was about how stability was found in movement, challenging the idea of mobility as 'disruption'. Mobility itself became a way of living and indeed belonging. But what of those uncertain places and spaces of encounter the tourist finds himself or herself in when the coach (necessarily) stops. When it becomes time to leave the community (Blackshaw, 2010) and disembark the coach?

Disruption to the multiple rhythms and pace of life on-board the coach presents a potential challenge to the coherence of the spatial and social performance of community. As we came to a stop we were once again required to make and re-make space as we left (and returned to) the coach.

Of interest to me was the outcome of these breaks on the (im)mobile world of the individual and the community. In particular, I wanted to explore the (on-going) negotiation of identity and the role of (partial) immobilities that became a fundamental part of the everyday practices of those of us on the coach tour. As I have shown in the previous chapter, there are immobile events aplenty on the coach – after all we remained seated for extended periods of time. This however, is to consider such immobility as a superficial or surface ‘stillness’. As I sat ‘in’ (and became a part of) the coach my body
moved through time and space, in many cases for hours on end and over distances of hundreds of kilometres (Bissell, 2010, Adey, 2010). Yet that was not the only movement or mobility. As I have discussed, performing the passenger entails a complex amalgam of routines and rituals in order to accomplish the intricate mobilities that were enmeshed within the banalities of everyday life on board the coach.

In this chapter I make use of the breaks to the physical mobility of the coach – ‘stopping points’ if you will – as a heuristic device. I do so to explore how so called ‘comfort stops’ acted to unsettle those established spatial and social relations of the mobile community and in the process (re)constructed both the coach and the stopping places as heterotopic. Along with other touristic spaces, these are sites “that have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way to suspect, neutralise, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror or reflect” (Foucault, 1986, pg. 24).

These were initially places of otherness, where the coach and the place in which we alighted could be considered inconsistent with any sense of the ‘life’ (Hetherington, 1997) we had co-constructed whilst being mobile (or at ‘home’). As individuals, we had worked (more or less successfully) to construct a cohesive, functional mobile community. However, given the purpose of the group tour is to tour other places, there is a necessary break, or disruption to the rhythms and mobilities of the coach. There are numerous types and manifestations of possible rupture or disruption to the tour. These included: disruptions to corporeal mobility; to routines and rhythms; spatial disruptions; disruptions to performance; disruptions to comfort; social disruptions and disruption that were of a sensual/ous nature.

In order to explore disruptions, this chapter is broken into two distinct but overlapping parts. In part one I focus on discussing disruption and places of disruption more generally and link these to the case of tourist mobilities. In part two my focus turns to a number of those practices of everyday life from which we cannot escape, but which, to all
extent and purpose, are mediated out of the tourist experience. Of particular interest to me was how the negotiated performance(s) of these disruptions resulted in routinised performances and techniques that, in turn, worked to (re)configure membership and belonging within the tour group (that pull it apart and put it together again). Concepts of rhythm(ia) and arrhythmia give structure to the discussion. Performances of daily life built around temporal and spatial rhythms exhibited characteristics of arrhythmia that, in turn, challenged the structural performance(s) of the self.

6.2 Disruption(s)

This chapter emanates from my need to reconcile the contradictions inherent in the corporeal mobilities performed by the tourist and the desire for ‘placed’ experiences (pre)configured through (and embedded in) the tourist imaginary. I have previously talked of ways in which the tourist brochure (and other media) might negotiate the daily life of the tourist in order to maintain the image of ontological security. The organisation (tour company) does so in order to achieve its primary objective, which is to extract economic value/surplus through the visitation of places outside the individuals’ normal home-place. Thus the tourist is situated as the modern individual whom it is suggested, through the mobilisation of “social relations and other everyday experiences [is becoming] increasingly disembedded from physical locations” (Gustafson, 2006, pg. 668).

Much of our understanding of tourism and tourists focuses, in some form or another, on the movement(s) of people; either as collectives (and collectively) or as individuals. Much of the relevant literature constructs knowledge through a mobilities ‘lens’ or performance methodologies (and metaphors). However, the question can be asked as to what happens to the mobile community as well as to the individual when corporeal movement is, for a period of time, stilled.
As I look around me, I would have to agree with Urry's (2007) assertion, the world (or at least my world) is constantly on the move. I spend upwards of 3 hours a day commuting by train and bus; due to the miles I regularly fly I have been awarded elite status by the national airline. I walk 40 minutes to a gym in order to run on a treadmill for thirty minutes (whilst paradoxically stationary). Even the food I consume is mobile, having come from various places around the globe (Cook, 2006). But this focus on how mobile everyday life appears is to neglect the inherent immobilities that exist within my own and other lives.

It is somewhat incongruous that tourism, which is often defined by corporeal mobility (Urry, 2002a), is also characterised by intense periods of ‘stillness’ and ‘mooring’ (Bissell and Fuller, 2010) in which differently mobile performance(s) (and behaviours) become the defining feature. It is in such periods that individual becomes characterised by specific (and often visible touristic) practices. Amongst these is the exteriorising practice of the mass (group) tourist. However, in many cases one’s apprehension of the tourist is in part a result of the tensions between one’s own subjectivities (our attempts to separate ourselves from the world of the tourist even though it is a world we inhabit) and tourism as an institutional (economic) order, and of what it means to be and perform the actor-as-tourist.

As such, (institutional) circuits of production and consumption intertwine to produce the un-situated ‘tourist-as-object’. For me, tourism was something we did. Furthermore, to a greater or lesser extent we had a kind of pre-theoretical knowledge of the required performances (almost baggage if you will, see also chapter four). As Berger and Luckman (1967, pg. 83) remind us, this institutional order (of the tourist performance) is; the sum total of ‘what everybody knows’ about a social world, an assemblage of maxims, morals, proverbial nuggets of wisdom, values and beliefs, myths and so forth...every institution has a body of transmitted recipe knowledge, that is
knowledge that supplies the appropriate institutionally appropriate rules of conduct.

My objective in the following section, following Southerton (2006), is to focus on analysis and discussion of the temporal organisation of daily life and the allocation of social constraints and practices that occurred as a consequence of the disruption to our daily rhythms on board the coach.

6.2.1 Disruption(s)

Tourism is often suggested as a way of rupturing the tedious and repetitive nature of everyday life (see chapter one). Frequently, there is a suggestion that performing in a time and space of difference might offer the individual the opportunity to re-enchant one’s life through immersion in, and performance of, the exotic. It is important however, to rethink what is being disrupted or, more appropriately ruptured. For many tourists, and certainly it is suggested this is the case with mass (coach) tourism, disruption is often considered primarily from a geographical perspective (Obrador-Pons et al., 2009b). More often than not this is normalised as an escape from emplaced aspects of home. Thus tourism is considered a way to disrupt the mundane routines and rhythms of everyday life (Edensor, 2012). As such, there is a necessity to deal with any negative outcomes of such disruption. Tacit acknowledgement of any disruption to the minutiae of daily life is mediated by institutional discourse(s) (see chapter four). As individuals we become complicit, along with the organisation, in re-imagining the rhythms of a daily life to come. For example, any concerns over disruption to eating or sleeping are nullified when we are reassured our hotel will combine “style and comfort...with a sense of tranquillity, truly a home away from home” (Tour Brochure). As I have shown in chapter four, disruptions to everyday life are mediated through particular ideological narratives. As Thompson (2012, pg. 901) argues “it is the dialectical obverse of a globalizing capitalism that ‘unworlds’ us”, thus our (successful) being in the world elsewhere is enabled through global corporations such as fast food and hotel chains.
In the context of the coach tour this means that the brochure is an agent of ideological capitalism and acts as a space where economic institutions (such as the tour company) in the 'deworlded world' become fixated on the security of the individual (Thompson, 2011). The potential unintelligibility of the ‘others’ world is cast aside; or at the very most we are admitted to (and become aware of) ‘their’ world only where there exists capitalist modes of production and consumption – the hotel, the road side café, the pay toilet. As such there is the possibility for an active playfulness in ‘othering’ (of the toured and touring) in the spaces and places of everyday (immobile) life.

The performance of everyday life is often taken for granted, and it is its very antithesis to performing the tourist life that leads to it being overlooked in much of the tourism literature (Larsen, 2008). However, any rupturing of the mundane and banal challenges the individual’s subject position, confronting the ontological coherence of the self (as well as object). Of course this also provides challenges to the community-of-the-coach. Key here is the physical boundedness of the coach, the materiality, which created proximity for, if not integrity to, the community. However, the stability (and integrity) of the community as object “is related, in part, to the specific relations of travelling-in-dwelling and dwelling-in-travelling in which [it is] constituted” (Lury, 1997, pg. 78). Thus, the very stopping of the coach challenged and changed its function as travelling ‘place’. Whilst mobility remained its symbolic role, at the stopping place the coach became a space of dwelling. Thus the coach in the coach park represents (the tourist as) other dwelling or space of refuge.

My focus now turns to spaces of disruption; from organisational to micro-social and in particular, institutionally sanctioned disruptions. In other words, those disruptions that are (or are not) represented and dealt with by the brochure and are played out through the performance of, and engagement with, the itinerary.
6.2.2 Institutionally sanctioned disruption – imagined disruptions

A possibility for travel becomes the space where the individual might become cognisant of their internal dialogue. It is the imagining of tourism that "makes possible the 'inward voyage', whereby a movement through geographical space is transformed into an analogue for the process of introspection" (Galani-Moutafi, 2000, pg. 205). Or as Wearing and Wearing (1996) suggest, it is the performances of the tourist as 'choraster', that works to engender self-change.

Although self-change may be one possible outcome, there are a multitude of everyday (seemingly unchanging) practices that we initially bring with us on holiday (McCabe, 2002, Edensor, 2007, Larsen, 2008). It is these mundane but necessary activities we must perform which the comfort stop has as its rationale. It is such spaces (and places) that are central in the pre-configured imaginary mediated through the pages of the brochure. It is through such imaginaries that any (perceived) challenge to the tourist self was removed.

As I have argued in chapter four, the brochure is an ambiguous space. As such it enabled the organisation to both sell the exotic whilst ensuring any possible ruptures or disruptions that might act to challenge the daily life of the tourist were ostensibly dealt with ahead of time. In the construction of the dialectic (tourist) imaginary we also bought into the institutional delimitation of the itinerary. We, the reader, became complicit in the construction of commercialised rhythms and routines. Such disruptions are about institutional requirements for mobility. Here the road we were travelling on was symbolic not only of movement but also disruption. Breaking from the rhythm of the route was about establishing other mobilities, an empty stomach to be filled (and emptied), a fuel tank to be filled (and the subsequent networks of mobilities at the site itself).
Clearly an objective of the brochure is to present a valorisation of the touristic experience, and it therefore necessarily creates an opaque representation of daily life of the tourist in order to minimise one imagining ontological risk. Thus, disruptions to daily life become controlled and managed by the institution. In doing so, individual agency was subjugated to the will of the tour company (as proxy of the community?) or through the suggestion of negotiation with the tour director (Edensor 2008). After all, disruption is to suggest risk, if not to the individual then to the organisation, with regards to satisfaction and quality (ref?).

6.2.3 Mediating disruption - Itinerary

From a semiotic perspective the itinerary became sanctioned as a mimetic device, one where individual choice became substituted by security to and for our daily life. Disruptions and ruptures were managed and furthermore scheduled ahead of time and in turn became routinized and subsequently a mundane part of daily life on tour. The institutional discourse(s) of disruption acted towards a mutuality of recognition; one where the outcome was to ameliorate feelings of powerlessness of both the community and the individual.

Disruptions were scheduled; they were part of the imaginary and yet needed to be dealt with as a reality of touring. As such, the locus of our daily performance became about dealing with the ambiguity of daily life on tour. It was in such spaces the tour director, as proxy for the institution, worked to guide us between the exotic possibilities of the tourist performance and the disruptions presented to this tourist-self by those mundane and banal, but never-the-less essential, activities of daily life. Thus we were instructed as to what time we would leave the hotel in the mornings (and what time alarm calls would be requested of the hotel) and how long we would be travelling between stops; what time we would need to be back on-board the coach and what time we would get to our hotel in the evenings. In saying that, there were hints of co-design in the itinerary although, to all intents and purposes, built on the myth of consumer sovereignty.
(Korczynski and Ott, 2004). The work of touring was modulated by scheduling; however this was open to negotiation with, for example, the promise of getting "to the hotel early if [we] can manage to keep to time" (Tolga, Tour Director).

Whilst ostensibly about our comfort, the ordering of these disruptions to the mobilities of/on the coach were maintained and regulated by the commercial agenda. This was achieved through the blending of comfort and consumerism. Embodied practices that demanded disruption (to the body and coach) were scheduled for stopping places that provided opportunities for consumption of consumer goods and services. Such spaces became a space of blurred (hybrid) identity; both individual-as-tourist and individual-as-consumer were brought into play in such tourist-consumer sites as the potteries and carpet factories, represented through the brochure and now made real.

The importance here was on how disruptions rather than rupturing rhythms (of the coach/daily life) were operationalised to represent “the work needed to keep them going” (Trentmann, 2009, pg. 68). The affect was to desensitise the individual from the minutiae of daily life, which in turn acted to highlight the performance(s) of the tourist self (and touristic experiences).

The itinerary gave order to the progress of the coach tour and importantly, was working to construct and moreover, as Edensor (2008, pg. 484) suggests, “reinforce normative ways of understanding and experiencing the world” of the individual. In addition, the itinerary constructed particular temporal spatialities (Wang, 2006), where common sense representations of time and space became contested. The rhythms I have discussed previously (see chapter five) were constitutive of ‘coach-time’, conditioned by the mobile narrative of the itinerary. However the need for us to construct tourist/consumer/intimate places through (re)making the coach as an immobile technology (materiality), dominated the discourse surrounding comfort. Thus the itinerary (re)configured im/mobility through the representations and practice of
“institutionalised rhythms” (Edensor and Holloway, 2008, pg. 483). Whilst much of the day was taken up with travelling the focus of the itinerary was committed to commercial ends, including commissions for the tour director.

Plate 6.1 Tolga, the Tour director – beginning mobiities
6.2.4 The micro-mobilities of stopping

There was one particular performance that acted to both regulate the mobility and trajectories of our bodies. The rhythmic sensations apprehended through the coach would be disrupted by the noises associated with switching on the microphone; the tour director would stand at the front of the bus and inform us of the purposes of the stop (see Plate 6.5).

The imminent arrival of the coach at a stopping point heralded a distinctive touring mobility. After all, not only have we been ‘still’ for two or so hours but we had been promised a comfort stop. We yawned, stretched, conversed with those around us and shuffled and fidgeted in our seats. In our anticipation of becoming differently mobile, noise levels increased, excitement became palpable. Specific rhythms became apparent, sedentary bodies within the coach (see also chapter 5) became affected by various micro mobilities. When it became apparent we were about to stop heads would be seen to rise above the seat backs, turning to talk, turning towards windows, craning for the first sight of where we would be stopping and Vera would suddenly strike up a conversation,

As a collective we also engaged with particular social sensibilities and developed strategies when making comfort stops. Looking through my journal I read with interest that I was always one of the first to get up. Rather than viewing this as disruption, for example the disturbances caused by clambering over fellow passengers (Veijola and Valtonen, 2007), I understood the performance as an inherent aspect of the rituals and routines that became associated with configuring the leaving of our mobile world in order to enter (an)other place. However, this performance was not as simple as it might seem. I would initially make eye contact with those seated adjacent with me and directly behind them. Although there was always simultaneous movement (to get up), I was always encouraged by others to stand up first. This might be as I was competing with fellow males, and there was an implicit recognition that I was going to let Vera (the older lady) sitting next to me out first. Additionally, over time it became apparent who would
rush to get off, who would let others go; even to those who would compete to let others go first. A sense of orderliness prevailed (in itself allowing or forming a type of rhythm), the embodied performances and rhythms of stopping actively constructing how we would socially engage as part of our functioning community (Goffman, 1967). We were about to perform our institutionally proscribed role as ‘the tourist’. To that end we looked to our ‘tools of trade’; cameras were checked and rechecked, water bottles are taken (and money put in the jar)\(^{37}\), daypacks checked.

Although the coach, as mobile technology, ceased to move when we reach our destination (comfort stop/break/site seeing), we became, as individuals and community, differently mobile actors (Brown, 2012). Our bodies became released from the confines of the coach and as we disembarked, we became aware of the exotic sensualities around us (Dann and Jacobsen, 2003, Minca, 2000).

Alighting the coach brought us into new spaces of encounter, where rather than merely ‘gazing’, we become aware of, and importantly attuned to, the possibility of being gazed upon (Gillespie, 2006). We moved from the (physically) private and intimate space of the coach, to a public space of difference. Such places, at least on the surface, acted to destabilise identity performances (Bondi, 1998). We actively exteriorised as we moved (into and) in contested territory (Johnston, 2001). As such, there was a need to attend to what Brown (2012, pg. 802) suggests are “the mechanisms through which competing claims are asserted, communicated, negotiated and circumscribed in [such] spaces of encounter”. In being ‘outside’ of the material space of community, we were required to re-negotiate how “one body in relation to a differently embodied ‘other’ becomes acceptable or possible” (Brown, 2012, pg. 802).

\(^{37}\) Bottled water was provided on the coach, with an honesty ‘jar’ for payment.
The comfort stop was both an imagined and unimagined space. Although the tourist imaginary had been mediated through, amongst other things the tourist brochure, little had prepared us for the messiness of everyday life ‘off’ the road. Our imaginary was of luxury (western branded) hotels and fine dining represented through the production of rationalised, commodified images. However the reality of this particular tour (and many others) is made up of truck stops, toilet blocks, food outlets and the like. Such sites required us to encounter and negotiate spaces of otherness (Wearing and Wearing, 2006). However, to foreground the unknown and to foreground challenges to ontological security thus presents a risk to tourism as an institutional form. As I have suggested in chapter three, a coach tour is about the minimisation of risk. However, at the stopping place(s) we were now (potentially) in a space of both ‘othering’ and of being ‘othered’, where the reality of our individual (and collective) identity became open to contestation.

Directions given to us before we alighted the coach augmented the imaginary and were a structural response that managed the foreseen possibility of ‘risk’. The conversation became one where the tour director told us “the toilets for you are to the right of the coach...do not use the other toilets, you will not like them”. Whilst effectively essentialising identity, the tour guide engaged us in multiple hegemonic discourses. In situating us as consumers, and suggesting we were paying for services, he effectively propagated the myth of consumer sovereignty (Korczynski and Ott, 2004), further marking us as the capitalist tourist and the local as ‘oppressed’ other38 (Wearing and Wearing, 2006).

38 There were however opportunities to perform resistance through everyday life at comfort stops, something I discuss later in the chapter.
6.2.5 Placing disruptions and stopping

Within our everyday lives there were multiple rhythms. One in particular acted to control and regulate the human body (and mind); the comfort stop. On the surface these comfort stops were dictated by the need for us to perform various roles, for example that of the tourist. However thinking about how these stops acted to normalise daily mundane performances away from home encouraged me to dig beneath the surface to problematize the taken-for-grantedness of such biological imperatives. Thinking about how these rhythms acted to control, but were also open to disruption I needed to interrogate the specificities of these rhythms; to ask questions and challenge the banal performance of eating (and subsequent excretion) and thus to highlight the potentiality of the comfort stop as a site of knowing.

6.2.6 Stopping for comfort

The comfort stop has been suggested as a way to offer opportunities for economic benefit to local businesses (Downward and Lumsdon, 2004); however that is to neglect the minutiae, the corporeality, the opportunities it affords one to know the ‘other’. The performances of the comfort stop enabled me to tease meaning from the banal activities associated with it; how I might, for example, read the site of the comfort stop rather than as a supposedly non-place, as being replete with culture.

All the stopping places had a functional characteristic; but what I wanted to understand was the comfort in the stop. For me, in exploring everyday life and identity, it became important to acknowledge the comfort stop as more than a place we got off the bus, went to the toilet (and perhaps ate, drank and purchased souvenirs), re-boarded the coach and then departed. The comfort stop was (and remains) important. Whilst performance of daily life was dealt with as part of the tourist imaginary, the activities at the comfort stop became, during the tour, a set of concrete practices which, in turn, informed (became?) the routines, rituals and habits of those of us both off and on the coach.
Somewhat paradoxically, comfort stops as stopping places can be thought of as spaces between place (Crang, 2002). Importantly such places are themselves (re)configured by numerous mobilities; places to refuel not only the coach, but also the body (and mind). Alongside tourists sites these included cafes, petrol stations, and Internet cafes, for example. These places might be suggested as being brought into play by, amongst others, tourist/ism mobilities (Sheller and Urry, 2004). In contrast one might also consider the similarities between these stopping places and Augé’s (1995) conception of non-place, where such stopping points become “defined not by inhabitants, but habitué’s, where social relations become contractualised” (Crang, 2002, pg. 569). These were spaces where the coach stopped only temporarily, and in which few, even locals, dwelt.

Plate 6.2 The comfort stop

Of course, as a tour group we stopped at tourist sites, however these too were by and large devoid of overt signs of current habituation (of course excluding the detritus of those whom had dwelled here thousands of years past). After all, it was signs of past-dwelling, rather than contemporary dwelling that we had come to view; we stayed in the
'cosmopolitan' city but toured in search of the ‘other’ (Butler, 2006). For me, it is these stopping places that revealed opportunities for dasein (Heidegger, 1962), those spaces where our encounters opened up the possibility of a coherent being-in-the-world.

6.2.7 Performing the comfort stop

Without doubt comfort stops, through their rhythmic progression, acted to structure our days. These breaks, each of which occurred a maximum of two hours apart, may be broken down into three types which are outlined below. Whilst all planned within the itinerary, they are places that were socially constructed and consumed in distinctive ways.

The first type of break was for corporeal comforts. The need to eat and excrete were carried out in service areas, comprising petrol pumps and forecourt, a shop in which one could purchase petrol (local) and other goods (locals and tourists), and an area that provided space for travellers (local and tourist) to sit at tables to eat. In some cases there were also eating places that appeared to be separated from the main commercial areas. Some were places for locals in which tourist facilities had been added – in the main these consisted of truck stops (see plate 6.8). However there was, in all cases, a separation of facilities, where 'locals' toilets would be at one end of the complex, normally near the fuel pumps whilst ‘tourist’ toilets would be at the other end, often in close proximity of the shop. These types of places exhibited all the characteristics of transit spaces – producing and reproducing a mobile everyday life (Blaikie, 2004).

Whilst breaks to the movement of the coach appeared to be made for our ‘comfort’, these were also timetabled to afford economic opportunities for local tourist businesses (Downward and Lumsdon, 2004). The second sites were not primarily motivated by either an organisational or individual bodily need. Rather they were programmed stops to view particular heritage sites and were spaces where both tourists and locals were able to utilise the facilities. In these stopping places, facilities (and shops) had been built
around a tourist place. By this I do not want to displace others/locals, rather I am thinking of such a place as a kind of assemblage, which become ‘placed’ for us as tourists by its interconnectedness. Such place(s) “float around within mobile, trans-national networks of humans, technologies, objects and images that continuously connect and disconnect [them] to other places” (Larsen, 2006b, pg. 76). In many of the tourist types of places in which we stopped tourism services had appeared over the last two decades, for example in plate 6.3

Plate 6.3 Constructing tourist’ space

There was a feeling of temporariness about these outlets. Here time was brought into play. The construction of the stalls gave the place an air of the temporary, as if itself mobile – both culturally and physically.
Thirdly were those stopping places that appeared to be developed for the use of groups such as ours; and were associated with particular craft industries regarded as ‘must see’ and as such a part of our itinerary. These included carpet weaving, pottery and leather goods manufacturing. Toilets in these spaces appeared to be designed primarily for the use of international travellers (local culture was absent in the design of toilets for example). Whilst the heritage and craft stops were not primarily for ‘comfort’, use was made of the toilet facilities. Many of the places in which we stopped were dislocated from the surrounds. They were, in the main, not in urban areas and were inherently about spatial mobilities rather than stasis; communities were constructed around work, instead of dwelling.

6.3 Ambiguous performance-scapes

Given the contested nature of authenticity in the study of tourism (Reisinger and Steiner, 2006b) my focus in the following section is not to overtly address issues of authenticity; however the images and experiences I discuss cannot exist outside a discourse of
authenticity (Rickly-Boyd, 2012, Vannini and Williams, 2009). After all, the representations and designs employed in co-constructing the spaces I discuss are about furthering tourist myths. One of these myths is the suggestion that the individual is focused on a search for some form of authentic encounter (Wang, 1999, Wang, 2000). Rather, the following discussion seeks to explore everyday life and identity, through using the social construction of the stopping place as a contested tourist space.

Stopping places, rather than being either non-places or tourist places, were spaces that became open to re-enchantment (Ritzer, 1999) through the less than spectacular performances of every-dayness. It was performance of and in these stopping places that brought to life the dialectic involved in tourist experience. This included “authenticity and inauthenticity, autonomy and passivity, freedom and determinations, agency and structure” (Wang, 2006, pg. 66).

Plate 6.5 Co-constructing (im)mobile space
6.3.1 Places of glocalisation

It is interesting to note that heritage sites and motorway services might have more in common than one might think. The average time spent at a motorway services in the UK is 20 minutes, with in many cases, no economic benefit derived from the associated commercial enterprises (Lawrence, 1999 in Moran, 2005). Similarly a 20-minute stop at world heritage site Stonehenge in South West England has become no more than a toilet stop for most tour operators (Hill, 2009). Moreover, the motorway service station forecourt has become something of a non-place (Moran, 2005), a space through which we transit un-reflexively. However I want here, to think through Auge’s (1995, 2008) suggestion of the opportunities afforded to those strangers who utilise services by virtue of the services being a place that offers the possibilities of encountering local culture.

Comfort stops were often represented as spaces where ostensibly we did not need to think or perform as tourists. Indeed, we were often actively encouraged not to think of them as tourist spaces. Rather the representation of them was that they were designed to minimise encounters with local culture. It is in such places that we, as tourists, were separated from place specific cultural rhythms of daily life. Such places were not, however, bereft of cultural nuances; that is to say there are what might be termed cultural leakages, both material and embodied. After all, stopping places are sites/sights of encounter, both with others but also choreographed as spaces of encounter with other tourists (for example tour companies staggering stops so we did not run into other tours). However, in the main these encounters were with other tourists-as consumers, or with staff as non-persons (Ritzer, 2003), where the workers were the primary 'other', relegated to their own space to which we were not granted access, being unambiguously told to "not go there" by the tour director (Tolga). Thus place as experienced through encounters with locals became 'hidden' away from us tourists (Goffman, 1967)

For many, stopping at a motorway services is a habitual practice of everyday life. On leaving the coach however, aspects of these unthinking practices were brought to the
foreground as ways in which we managed our performance of comfort. Certainly I became aware of my experiential connection to the spaces of the forecourt, smells, noises and movement placed me. Whilst these spaces were replete with signs through which we mediated the forecourt, rather than these being “unstimulating or desocialised” as Edensor (2003, pg. 152) suggests, these signs acted as comforting familiarity. They directed us towards sites of everyday performance, into spaces which whilst being anchored in the local, remained safe but that never the less offered opportunities of becoming (money, types of toilets, people).

6.3.2 Eating
In the following section I want to focus on the performance of eating as part of our everyday lives on tour. As I have shown in chapter four, a key function of the brochure was to mediate a particularly commodified imaginary when it came to food. The reality of such performances is, however, made problematic as I show in the following examples.

6.3.2.1 Burger King
Rather than what might be considered emplaced culture, that is an otherness represented through the exotic gaze, institutional forces, such as globalising cultures of consumerism (Lury, 1996) created spaces that mediated both touristic and local cultural practices. Moreover, as Massey and Jess, (2004) suggest the intersection of relations across global and local spaces has resulted in the constitution of a hybrid culture. The forecourt was such a space where a merging of the global and the local was visible. This, however, is far from a simple process. Indeed it was one that rendered commercial consumption problematic. One particular example came to exemplify such space(s).
We had stopped for lunch and whilst we had been advised of where we should go to purchase lunch, I had seen a sign that suggested there was a global fast food restaurant across the other side of the motorway. My aim in choosing to get my lunch from the fast food restaurant rather than where we had been advised was twofold. One was as a form of resistance to institutional pressures placed on me to perform as part of the tour group; the other was more pragmatic, a limited budget. In hindsight it was rather ironic that I had chosen to mobilise such a globalised product in order to resist a globalising practice such as tourism. However, it was here that I began to think more carefully about the nexus of the global and the local.

This came about because of my inability to communicate my requirements to the staff (and easily order food – a functional role of such food outlets (Ritzer, 2011, 1993)). Whilst the photographs of the food were familiar to me, the names of the products themselves were not. I had to, somewhat embarrassingly, resort to pointing at images in order to communicate my consumer needs. Whilst clearly a manifestation of globalised
material culture local specificities, including language and spatial design (see Plate 6.15), worked ironically to restrict my access to what is after all a globalised product.

Plate 6.7 Consuming with ‘locals’

Thus, my lack of ability to clearly articulate my consumer needs (re)placed this space as outside of my cultural competencies. Although a well know brand, this was a space for those able to communicate. In this case whilst the branding and associated symbols influenced and conditioned the reception of communication (of the menu) I could not interpret these signs, which resulted in both miscommunication and the too-ing and fro-ing within my interaction with staff (Bolton, 2009).

When I returned (with my burger!) to where the others were eating, the comments from others made clear the ambiguity of spaces such as fast food restaurants. For others on
the tour the fast food restaurant was for locals (and where the ‘local’ consumes the west). The ambiguity here is that the initial global success of brands such as McDonalds and Burger King was built on neophobic tourist consumption, that is, the food produced enabled (primarily western) cultures to move globally (Wilk, 2009, Mak et al., 2012, Cohen and Avieli, 2004).

Plate 6.8 Global food?

Plate 6.9 Consuming the local?
Ironically, everyday life itself became a tourist attraction. There is increasing attention paid to the food of the ‘other’ – however this was regulated through both the organisation’s selection of places at which we stopped (however see section 6.5 below on arrhythmia) and also the role of the tour director as cultural broker, guiding us through menus and herding us into and out of designated (safe) eating areas. But who was consuming local culture?

Plates 6.8 and 6.9 represent performances in the same stopping place. Note that both contain elements of the global, Fanta, Coca Cola in one and Burger King in the other. However, one is designed for the consumption of locals whilst the other is consumed globally by tourists. In reality we were playing out an imagined space of cultural homogeneity – one not about place, rather one where the dominant discourse is ideological. A space where our identities, both local and other were manipulated, where it is not the burger that is truly king rather our performance as consumer reigns supreme, at least in our minds (Korczynski and Ott, 2004).

6.3.2.2 Vera’s ‘authentic’ eating place

Eating places and the eating of place is clearly articulated and represented through the borders of community, both of us and the locals. The stopping place becomes, to all intents and purposes, an enclavic space (Jordan, 2008). However, whilst the other - the staff member, the driver - is sanitised and re-presented as the non-person (Ritzer, 2003), there were attempts to enchant the everyday through the re-configuring of space and performance.

As I had attempted to subvert the community (and tourist imaginary) by eating at a fast food outlet, I was also in turn searching for what I hoped would be a meaningful, if not ‘authentic’ experience. In my conversations with Vera, I had talked about my interest in food. We had, over a period of time, talked about the ‘sameness’ of all the places in which we had been eating and how we were both looking for something different. The
discussion illustrates that even though I was consciously focusing upon performing the researcher and was particularly cynical regarding the search for the authentic, meaningful experience – I became that tourist (MacCannell, 1976, MacCannell, 1973).

We had just pulled into yet another truck stop. As normal, Tolga had directed us as to the places to eat and where to go to the toilet. However, on this occasion I wanted to experience a local toilet, so had headed off to the other end of the forecourt, the local space once again as far away as possible from that of the tourist. On my way back to the prescribed (tourist) area I was accosted by a number of the others in the community. Apparently Vera had also been off wandering and was now hurriedly searching for me (it did make me wonder if we were being viewed as a ‘couple’ as we sat together?). When I found Vera, it turned out she had found an ‘authentic’ Turkish eating place, one where, she excitedly told me, ‘we would even have to take off our shoes’.

Plate 6.10 Authentic experience?
I returned to the restaurant with Vera who had told the staff we were coming over. We were, at that point the only ones there (it being some 200 metres from the normal retail spaces). Here, I thought, was the authentic experience I had been looking for.

Neither of the staff (who Vera had suggested from her earlier communications with them were mother and daughter) spoke English. I had to take my shoes off; we had to sit on the floor; there was an elderly woman cooking; we were in a ‘nomadic’ tent. All in all, to me, at that point in time, we had found the ‘real’ experience. The food was difficult to order, we had to work at communicating, but it ‘tasted’ fantastic. I felt I had gone backstage. This was reinforced when others came over to see what we were doing (another couple had previously joined us in eating).

Plate 6.11 Performing the tourist subject
Initially I felt our choice had itself, been authenticated by others in the community. As we were gazed upon eating (see Plate 6.11) there were comments communicating disappointment that others had not seen it. We were the lucky ones as we did not have lunch in the truck stop; rather we were engaging with what, at least superficially, appeared as local and about place. We had rejected what we, and others, saw as tourist space and had reimagined what it was to be a tourist in this particular mobile community. Not only that, but we ourselves became, somewhat uncomfortably, subject to the tourist gaze – in turn data to be explored (also see chapter seven for a discussion on others being complicit in the research endeavour).

On re-boarding the coach the general conversation was about how some of us had achieved what might be regarded as an experience that was experientially authentic (Wang, 2000). Our status was further enhanced when the tour director talked of how the stopping place was at the foot of the Taurus Mountains, and in the winter the communities would come down from the mountains to work (the tour took place mid spring). In my imagination I could see the horses being loaded, and the annual migration underway. Through these imaginings my experience in the tent became one of being back-stage (MacCannell, 1976).

As we passed by the ‘tent’ I took a photograph that, at that moment made me begin to reflect on what had actually been happening. I began, again, to think as a researcher (or consumer dupe?).
On reflection I began to question the extent to which I had fallen into the trap suggested by Benjamin, where the focus of the (tourist) organisation was to commodify the individual within the confines of a ‘phantasmagorical world’. In my attempt to consume the ‘other’ through the everyday experience of eating in their place I had begun to question my own identity performance. I had even been willing to perform the ‘guest’ by removing my shoes.

In images 6.11 and 6.12 above, it can be seen the space was designed to create an aura of temporality (mobility), the roof/ceiling of the building was a mix of plastic and canvas tarpaulin – again creating an impression of mobility. However this mobility can been thought of in different ways, the success or otherwise of the business, as well as links to culture – where our guide told stories, for example, of how women would come down from the villages in the mountains in the winter to work. In the design process, heritage is used to subvert consumer ideology. For example in taking my shoes off I was no longer the sovereign consumer but the guest following the rules of the host (Domenico and Lynch, 2007). Mobility was also represented through furnishing – everything in sight
appeared to be mobile, it could be rolled up, picked up and taken away. Not only are we the tourist mobile, but the locals themselves perform mobility.

In counterpoint to the utopia (Alasuutari, 1995), we thought we had encountered, or the cultural idyll contained within the tent (Cloke, 2006), the external elements, for example the back of the building, had a feeling of being fixed in time and space. Unlike the images of the stalls (see image 6.20 above) there was an air of permanence about parts of this facility for instance the bench seating and pergola style constructions all sitting upon newly laid paving, along with a yet to be landscaped area of garden evident in the foreground of image 6.20.

On reflection my encounter was about stereotypes commonly called into play when othering both the ‘staff’ and performed space (Appadurai, 1996, Browne, 2007). It was only in hindsight that I started to think about things like prices and product cleanliness – knowing the market. Now, living in Sydney, I can have a very similar experience, where particular Turkish families have established authentic Gozleme outlets that appear in Mega malls, food markets and events at major stadia. What I was doing then (and now) might be considered as performing banal cosmopolitanism (Haldrup, 2009). This might be considered an attempt to perform the sophisticated tourist engaging with the local in his or her own terms. Whilst Edensor and Holloway (2008, pg. 483) argue against the tourist as a “duped, passive and shallow figure”, this is what I later felt. What is important here is the consumption and production of the mundane that was at the heart of the experience. Whilst looking for the locals everyday, I got the everyday experience I can get down the road from home.

I had been performing a hybrid culture brought about through globalisation; in this case food and the tourist search for authenticity. I had come to terms with, and had accepted, the rules of being a member of the community but had challenged these when I went off script and attempted to eat at a fast food restaurant. However I had also bought into this
script with my performance at the touristic restaurant. It is was thinking about the relations between the spaces set aside for tourist consumption of food and the fast food restaurant, which came to represent, for me, the contestation between globalising and globalised spaces (Hardt and Negri, 2000). On the surface, at least, we are led to believe that, for example fast food outlets, work towards constructing a globalised space that in turn, (re)configures the individual within the framework of a homogenised culture of consumption – the citizen consumer.

Rather than thinking of global brands as simply globalized spaces, they themselves are inherently ‘placed’. After all, whilst consuming a global product (Burger King with all the associated global networks) I was localized whilst consuming. I could not order and wait for the product to reach me – I had to engage in a series of localized (spatial and temporal) encounters. From negotiating the spaces across the motorway, to interpreting the menu board; placing my order – finding somewhere to eat (and have an embodied local/global experience) to disposing of my waste. Whilst I knew the signs (images of burgers for example) I was reminded that “to recognise that we all inhabit everyday life is not to deny social differences but simply a common grounding in the mundane” (Felski, 2000, pg. 92).

### 6.4 Disrupting daily rhythms

I now want to focus on a particular disruption to the rhythms of the tour. Whilst I have previously discussed sanctioned disruptions – or those that have ostensibly been imagined prior to joining the FIGT (i.e. the comfort stop), I want to turn to those that occurred outside of the pointillist rhythms of the itinerary (Bissell, 2012b). The examples and vignettes I will now discuss are about discomfort. However, more than a rupture to established routines, they are about embodied and affective discomfort. When thinking about the impact of embodied ruptures to the tour, and especially the established
rhythms I was reminded of the following section of Auden’s poem, *The Geography of the House*:

```
Mind and Body run on
Different timetables:
Not until our morning
Visit here can we
Leave the dead concerns of
Yesterday behind us,
Face with all our courage
What is now to be
```

W. H. Auden (1966)

In the discussions above I have talked about how the temporary stillness of the coach is structured within multiple rhythms, including those of the organisation (the tourism system and institution), the individuals’ requirement to perform the tourist, the needs for both the body and the coach to refuel. The rhythms of the tourist imaginary thus produce specific temporal characteristics. However, no matter how tight a control the organisation had over our day-to-day lives, both on board and off the coach, sanctioned routines become open to contestation. Notably challenges to the body (and one’s control of the body) were “disrupted and made irregular, producing bodily arrhythmia and a consequent discomfort” (Edensor, 2012, pg. 64). Such ruptures disrupt and challenge the collective (and individual) practices that regulated both the tour and our bodies-on-tour. Here the needs of the body clashed with the needs of the tourism (economic) system.

### 6.5 Arrhythmia

I want to focus here upon particular performances that themselves can be considered rhythms, but that acted to disrupt the routines and performances – the daily banal rhythms of the community on the road. Such arrhythmic practices are important as they
equally work with and against established rhythms to configure space and time (Edensor, 2012) and identity practices. As I have suggested, the itinerary, along with the brochure, mediate a safe, regular and non-confrontational imaginary. In suggesting that rhythms are sustained in and through the brochure it needs to be remembered that “rhythms continually change, intersecting and flowing in diverse ways”, not only are they often unexpected but “where they are apparently repetitive and regular, they are apt to be punctured, disrupted or even curtailed by moments and periods of arhytmy” (Edensor, 2010a, pg. 193). However, rather than merely those performances that are an integral part of the tourist imaginary and implicit in the discursive construction of the tourist, arrhythmia acts to challenge dominant (and especially institutional) discourses. I want to use a vignette in addition to images to introduce the main focus of the section – bodily performance of the comfort aspects of the comfort stop. The performances I discuss had significant impact both on the community and our performances of (the social) self. In the first instance I want to draw attention to a case of illness that struck down a number of the group, including myself, which then links into the performance of what is at the heart of the euphemistically titled comfort stop.

6.5.1 Illness

The following vignette highlights a particular disruption that implicates the (mobile) body in negotiating and subsequent (re)configuration of daily mobilities. Moreover, it also drew my (and others on the tour) attention to those aspects of everyday life at home that were left unsaid in the tourist brochure (which I address through the subsequent vignette and analysis). In exploring the affects and effects of illness, it highlights how one might know through-the-body. This was a performance that took place almost midway through the tour. Arrhythmia, in this case physical illness, whilst disruptive, required dealing with as the structural rhythm of the tour needed to be maintained.

However, whilst acknowledging these organisational (structural) rhythms, this arrhythmic episode resulted in frictions (Cresswell, 2010) within the hegemonic
rhythms. Likewise, it resulted in what Vannini (2009a) might suggest as a speed bump to the FIGT. My focus is not to deal at length with illness and health, but rather to illustrate how the body acted, through illness, to influence the performance of community (and see chapter seven for ‘self’) in spaces of adversity. I certainly do not want to trivialize or take away from the disenchantment(s) caused by illness (Frank, 2002), rather to look at how, somewhat paradoxically, illness enchanted the tour.

...spent most of last night over the toilet bowl. Possibly the nicest view from any hotel room so far. Somewhat ironically, the toilet had a glass window and I could watch the sunrise as I was ‘waiting’ on the toilet. I can’t remember ever feeling this ill! Don’t know how I can keep on ‘going’...Went downstairs to check out and most of the others were milling around talking with each other. Given that we had started to break into smaller groups this was noticeably different to yesterday morning. I joined in to find out six others have the same 'bug'. Three have been to hospital – Tolga (TD) hadn’t gone and none of the medical staff could speak English!! Apparently, after some confusion and web searching they were told it was norovirus...

This illness and what it has done to the community made me return to my journal and see a) what might have caused it and b) if we had talked about any of these sorts of things prior to becoming ill

Vera had been talking about the couple behind us coughing over the last day – how she didn’t want to ‘catch’ anything.

Illness is something that for many remains a realm of the private, it is about repressing the affect of illness from others (outside significant others) (Lupton, 1998). However, given our proximity to each other, as well as the community we had established, illness had a profound effect and affect.

It is suggested that between 7.2% (Launders et al., 2013) and 24% (Evans et al., 2001) of tourists undertaking a FIGT will have some form of intestinal illness or upset. Given the
age range of those on tour there was always the possibility, if pushed to the back of the mind, of illness. As Cunningham-Burley (1998, pg. 144) suggest,

The middle years... are likely to be a period when the body is very much in biological evidence— corporeal and mortal. It may be getting sick, too fat or too thin, tired and even dying. In this period, people may also be concerned about management and maintaining their bodies, and perhaps those of others, for example older relatives. This may impact on their personal and social relationships.

For me, this was certainly not a chronic illness. In normal circumstances, at home, it would require a day off work and the ministering’s of a loved one. However, given that we had to be physically mobile, it challenged how others and I made sense of daily life on the tour.

Initially at least, it disrupted the rhythms of the night; sleep disturbed by trips to the toilet, or worse, to the emergency clinic at the local hospital. In such cases the imaginary constructed through the brochure was also challenged. As such the outcome of performances associated with the illness became what might be considered antagonistic rhythms (Meadows, 2010). The linear rhythms of daily life on tour, travelling, site-seeing, resting, were fractured. Indeed, the rhythms were brought to the foreground because of this disruption – and in turn made me ask questions of how we might perform the mundane. Illness became a challenge to both the solidarity of our community as well as to our individual ontological security – how, for example, does one converse with a doctor who does not speak English?

My (and others) loss of control of our bodies (Jensen, 2013) created frictions that disrupted, slowed down and in one case temporarily ceased the mobility of the FIGT (Löfgren, 2008b). Such disruption presented an opportunity for disappointment and frustration from others in the community. After all it was also their experience that was
being disrupted. However it was illness that for me reinvigorated the reality of the FIGT as communitas. The following excerpt from my research diary illustrates the care that was shown to me:

The Irish couple offered some medicine– I was surprised by the fact that most had medications... The interventions of others suggests to me previous experience of illness (the sharing of knowledge(s) gained through previous travel – of coping with frictions in everyday live. It reminds me of Philip Vannini’s comment in Ferry Tales on running out of pills on an island. Fred and his wife offered me ginger pills. When I expressed surprise people started showing me the stuff they brought with them (Couples work as a team to strategically manage everyday life – washing powder to one, charger to husband who puts in shoes, medicines shared). I learnt about arrhythmia through embodied experience...I SHARED it with others...I had become, physically, data to be studied. How can one know others visceral mobilities...through stories, shared illness.

Illness regenerated community, a kind of enhanced solidarity emerged in dealing with illness becoming an affective space in which we (re)negotiated our ‘remove’ or relative separation from the world through which we were travelling. I talked in the previous chapter of how we were insulated but also isolated from the world through which we travelled. However, it was a rupture to the coordinated and institutionally choreographed rhythms brought about through illness that (re)connected one (both literally and viscerally) to the land through which we travelled. We became, if only tenuously, connected to the realities of those everyday lives of others that inhabited and called these spaces home. The problem of remove is that it isolated us from the realities of an everyday that allows us to survive. We become so enmeshed in the imaginary that the realities of the ‘damaged’ body were, to a greater or lesser extent, forgotten. Illness

39 The care shown me by others in the community was emotionally overwhelming. In reality I did not know how to respond to the ministrations of others. Certainly I had lost any sense of being ‘outside’ the community as a researcher.
and the subsequent loss of control of our bodies created frictions to the smooth operation of the tour.

The results of illness were twofold – one was certainly the friction to the rhythm. In this case the rhythms imposed by the itinerary needed re-mediation. The domination of the mind, performed through for example the gaze was superseded by a need to attend to the embodied aspects of corporeal mobility away from home. Thus, the embodied needs of those that became ill were foregrounded with a subsequent renegotiation of the organisation’s itinerary. New mobilities of the body took precedence. All of a sudden toilet stops took on new relevance – the body’s needs took on new importance and there was a legitimation of the ‘power’ of the body. The structure of the day became dictated by those of us that were ill. Rather than the consensus of the community as expressed through the imaginary, the affect of illness was collective – the tour director (as the organisation’s emissary?) was required to re-negotiate rhythm. This, of course, placed all of us at risk of the outcome of unscheduled disruptions; of strangers in strange places. We thus found ourselves in a situation that the brochure had attempted to mediate out of the imaginary. Our community identity was redefined by the “cultural continuum of illness and health” (Stoller, 1997, pg. 4).

Arrhythmia posed challenges, to the brochure, to the “legitimating role that the media plays in the repetitions of everyday life. Instead of banal banter on the media-produced present, this manufactured present torments [one] to the point of hysteria” (Meadows, 2010, pg. 87). The foregrounding of hitherto taken for granted routines and rhythms (mobile regimes?) become questioned – the body created its own agency (Lupton, 1998)

In the discussion above, the body informed the re-negotiation of disruptions to the rhythms of the tour. This was about ‘nature’ or natural rhythms of the body being disrupted and taking their own course. The disruptions were out of our control. Due to the nature of the virus, the body controlled the mind. The notion of toilets was as a site of
arrhythmia but also renewal (the expunging of illness). However, in the following section I want to discuss arrhythmic disruptions where the imaginary was challenged through the trials brought about through consciously resisting control. It was here space and performance became a site for both individual and collective negotiation between mind and body. This resulted in arrhythmic practices where different aged members of the group responded differently to the body’s call for an unscheduled comfort stop. This brings me onto a topic that whilst as essential as seating is to the maintenance of daily life was nevertheless missing from the tour brochure, the performance of ‘toileting’.

6.5.2 The unscheduled toilet stop

In this section I wish to engage with the body specifically within the dynamics of the community and its cohesiveness. One important negotiation of space that stood out was that between private and public performance spaces. I want to begin this discussion by invoking a particular aspect of the imaginary.

Going to the toilet is something all of us do, most without giving it much thought and often as part of a daily routine. A biological necessity, it is also a habitual, almost ritualised aspect of everyday life. It is a behaviour that is trained into us from a young age (Haslam, 2012). However it is also a (embodied) performance imbued with social rules; a performance that is intensely personal both in the private and public spheres (Noren and Molotch, 2010). It is an embodied act that remains, in many cultures, one that is hidden, not only from view but also from everyday talk (Longhurst, 2001). The performance of going to the toilet is likewise a negotiation between mind and body – one that in polite society is out-of-mind as well as inherently out-of-body. That being said, the toilet is a subject where boundaries are often (figuratively) crossed and open discussion made possible through humour (Moore, 2009). One can see this, for instance, in the regularly occurring satirisation of Sheldon’s daily bowel movements, represented through the obsessive-compulsive ritual of the character’s toileting performance in the comedy TV show The Big Bang Theory.
Understanding toilet stops as implicit within the wider regulatory processes of the FIGT allowed me to think about how particular rhythms acted upon my hourly, daily and weekly lived experiences of the tour. Toileting and associated activities are part of the (overlooked) fabric of our everyday lives. However, there are times when our routines away from home become subject to disruption, caused by the unforeseen need to perform these acts. To ‘get caught short’ is a common idiom in many Western societies. As the UK’s Daily Telegraph newspaper rather humorously suggests; outer space, the ultimate tourist destination “… is possibly the last place you'd want to get caught short - 220 miles above the Earth, travelling at 17,500 mph and with no gravity” (Elsworth, 2008). However humorously we may view these items, they serve to illustrate the importance of toilets and toileting when away from home. Moreover, many of us, certainly in the western world, are judged by the results of our toileting. From the performance of hygiene practices in public (toilet) spaces, to the embodied outcomes of personal hygiene performance(s) – the extent to which we maintain and perform an expected state of public cleanliness is part of our daily-lived social encounters.

The brochure did not deal openly with our ability to maintain this essential aspect of everyday life. What it did highlight however was the availability of what was rather euphemistically labelled as a ‘restroom’ on board the coach. However, as both a neophyte researcher and a FIGT member I did not (before the tour) fully understand the symbolic meaning contained within numerous comments regarding the ‘frequent stops made along the way’. Nor did I understand the extent to which the mediation of such stops was used by the organisation to control one’s use of the toilet on board the coach.

The organisation mediated the conversation about our performances of the toilet on board through both monologic and dialogic encounters. Not only through the brochure but also, for example, during the welcome cocktails where we were instructed of the permitted use of the on-board toilets. As the Tolga, the tour director confirmed, “The coach has an on-board toilet; however in the interests of all, could I please ask that you
only use the toilet if it is an emergency”. Further emphasis was given when introducing particular (im)mobilities of the tour as Tolga reassured us that “...in our timetable we have planned numerous comfort stops”.

Whilst a toilet on board the coach was indirectly referred to, and its use obliquely restricted, the actual use of the word toilet, as well as the bodily performance, was removed from the structure of the group tour. Given the age of the group, the reference to comfort stops assuaged any reference to bodily movements and maintained, even if externally, a sense of propriety within the group (Stead, 2009). However this discourse was problematized on board the coach during a number of conversations I had with fellow passengers. There was the need to reinforce to me (as well as the other coach tour neophytes), the unspoken rules regarding the use of the toilet. It was communicated obliquely that the on-board toilet was not to be used. For example, as ‘Judith’ stated, “...we never use the toilet, it’s such a hard place to use...”. Given the relative steepness of the steps leading to the toilet and the limited mobility of some of my fellow passengers this was of no surprise. However, one might also think through this in the context of wider issues of accessibility (Bichard et al., 2006), as well as social control.

After the tour I was sent a photograph by (Emma), which depicts a particular issue faced when using the on-board toilet; one that might be described as the toilet gaze (see plate 6.13).
Plate 6.13: Walking back from the toilet – we can see you!

This illustrates rather nicely the particular gaze on those who use the coach toilet. The image represents both the hidden nature of access to public toilets (Cooper et al., 2000), and additionally to a particular exteriorising (toilet) gaze. As such, it highlights a mechanism through which the community actively maintained and controlled the use of the toilet (internal gaze). This might be understood as a collective surveillance, that in turn, and certainly for me resulted in a subjective, controlling surveillance of self. One where I might, as part of the community, intersubjectively (visually) engage with others, therefore offering me a glimpse of how I my-self, might be seen as breaking the rules. Moreover it highlighted, to me, how I as a social actor consciously constructed and performed “an internal discipline of self-control” (Giddens, 1999 pg. 57) during the tour. Thus, to be part of this community I was required to engage my mind in a kind of disciplining of corporeality to maintain and manage a ‘docile body’ (Foucault, 1977, Foucault, 1995).
The following vignette represents a particular disruption to the routines of everyday life on board the bus. I have chosen this particular scene as it showcases issues of control introduced above, both within the community and also of our embodied selves.

*The three of us neophytes, the youngest on the group and the only ones not to have been on a fully inclusive tour were sharing the back seat, alongside me was V. We had left Konya and had travelled about an hour and were heading towards the Tarus mountains on the way to Antalya. As per other mornings we were not due for our first comfort stop for about another hour. However this morning was different, both in proximity to others and the performance and conversations this allowed. Normally I would only converse with those sitting across the aisle (I had an aisle seat to allow V who was a fellow single traveller the window seat) somewhat sporadically, either when we stopped to get off the bus, or conversely on the bus, or occasionally when topics of conversation by Tolga (TD) encouraged general discussion. My proximity (in the back seat I was sitting next to, rather than across from my fellow group members, (Emma and Lucy) to others this morning enabled a somewhat different discussion and performance to happen.*

*My conversation with the two ‘girls’ (as they had been labelled by the group due to their relative youth) was about needing to go to the toilet. To all intents and purposes this was a conversation we should not have been having, and I am certain I would not have had with anyone else on the bus. The conversation revolved around the three of us needing to go to the toilet. The conversation then became a discussion on the possibilities of using the on-board toilet. I on the one hand was not prepared to use it and made a comment on how I ‘would rather hold it, than be subject to the looks of all the others’. Aussie 1 (the younger) said that she agreed; however Aussie 2 said that she would go and use it anyway. We both attempted to dissuade her from using the toilet. It was then decided that if she were to not use the toilet then I would use my*
'relationship' with Tolga to 'get him to stop the bus'. At this stage I went to the front of the coach to see if we could stop the bus. However, rather than asking to stop the bus my discourse surrounded trying to communicate my need via a more circuitous route - whereby I was trying to engage him by asking when our next comfort stop would be, alluding to the need to stop rather than asking directly. On returning to my seat I was confronted by the two girls and rather apologetically communicated that we would need to travel for another hour or more. Needless to say this didn't go down to well. Whilst I (having been subject to Rugby club coach trips) was prepared to discipline both my bladder and self, this was not the case with the two 'girls'. The tour director by this stage had recommenced his discussion on the day ahead. In order to maintain some form of 'identity' (more self esteem?), and discipline, even though this was an undisciplined act, I motioned to the TD gesturing at the two girls and attempting to communicate their (rather than my) need to make a toilet stop. At this point he came down the bus to talk to us and agreed that he would ask the driver to make an unscheduled stop within 10 or so minutes. It was apparent to me that this was not really what he wanted to do, and it was only because of the gender of the other two that he acquiesced. At this stage none of our fellow group members had any idea of what was happening. However on returning to the front Tolga promptly asked if there were any others in the group who needed to stop for the toilet. It was interesting (although more so in hindsight) that no one acknowledged the need to stop the bus. Tolga consequently spoke to the driver who then after 10 or so minutes pulled the bus to a stop outside a petrol station, located on its own, with no other buildings in sight. Tolga then announced to the group that this was an unscheduled stop and that therefore the facilities would not be suitable for tourists. As we (rushed) off the bus I was rather surmised to note that most of our fellow group also got off and followed us to the toilet...so much for no one else needing to stop. The toilets were certainly different to many of those we had been to; no 'seated' toilets, water hoses and no toilet paper. After finishing I went into the garage to purchase (ironically) some water and
found that is was unlike any of the garages we had previously stopped in. Most noticeable was the absence of tourist paraphernalia including craft wares and the ubiquitous 'evil eyes'? normal available in a range of sizes!

This unscheduled stop represented a risk; not merely in our use of non-tourist facilities, but also called into question the organisation's ability to mediate the imaginary and to subsequently control our experience. The challenge to our ability to control the body created space for individual agency.

In this case internal power relations (within the community) that affect the reality of the body were disrupted by the power of the body itself. Certainly in my case the corporeality of my body, the very physicality of the need to go to the toilet acted in direct opposition to the masculine domination of the consciousness (or my conscious self, became subject to corporeal desires, the desire of 'release'). However, the ability for me to control the performance of my body was subsumed (overcome?) by the irrationality of particular bodily sensualities. It is interesting to note how I continued to invoke a somewhat masculine discourse including the reference to rugby coach trips, where if one was required to 'pee' then it was either into a handy receptacle, or one 'held on' until the next group enforced stop (Cooper et al., 2000). As such, my performance of gender was troubled through the supposed irrationality of the body. The reaction of our fellow group members acted to re-enforce this corporeal 'weakness' when none of them acknowledged (openly) a need to go to the toilet. This was only resolved through the actual embodied performances within the toilets themselves where there was implicit acknowledgement through shared performances, the washing of hands for example. One might suggest here that the habitat40 of the group, rather than being a closed system as

---

40 Here I understand habitat as a space where unreflexive performance enable continuity and stability of the group (see e.g. Edensor, 2002)
suggested above, might rather be viewed as “an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pg. 133). This allowed me space to act as an agent; rather than to problematize my (and our) acceptance within the group, I was afforded the ability to modify the community itself.

The modification of the itinerary afforded me the opportunity to think how the biological need for the toilet shaped and managed particular rhythms within the tour. In this particular case, the challenge of a contested embodied rhythm (the inability to hold) affected the wider social rhythm of the bus, displaying an “ability of the body to affect and be affected by a multitude of other rhythms” (Simpson 2008, in Edensor, 2010b pg. 5). This in itself acts to problematize the social disciplining of the (my) body as discussed above.

Once back on the bus there were no recriminations for an unscheduled stop of the bus, or to the disruption of the daily rhythms we had built up over the time we had spent together. Rather, I would suggest that the corporeal responses to the actual stopping of the bus, the use of the toilets by most of the other community members resulted in a kind of affectual consensus between the group, thus ultimately legitimating our need to stop the bus. It is further suggested that this internal (and indeed external or bodily) discipline is a necessary part of one’s lived everyday and furthermore, is “integral to the very nature of ...being accepted (trusted) by others as being competent” (Giddens, 1999, pg. 57); an affective outcome of this performance of self-discipline was to be accepted by the group.

6.5.3 Performing scheduled arrhythmia

Sightseeing and eating at comfort stops were the main focus used to construct daily rhythms, although at times the toilet itself became the tourist site.
Plate 6.14 The toilet as ‘authentic’ tourist site.

The potential disruption or challenge to our ontological security was assuaged by the repeated utterances of the idea of the ‘tourist toilet’ or ‘toilets for tourists’. Here the comfort stop and the ‘tourist toilet’ acted as a “technolog[y] of comfortable mobility which [acted] to insulate passengers from the potential epistemological and physical discomfort of the outside world…” (Edensor, 2007 pg. 203). Moreover, the world through which we travelled was actively ‘othered’ by our use of tourist toilets. Here the use of local toilets was controlled and thus issues of cultural disgust at using non-western toilets, at least in planned stops was mediated out. Importantly, these spaces also ensured that there was little interaction between local and tourist, minimising the opportunity for our embodied toilet habits to cause offence or for us to be “mock[ed] for the common occidental inability to squat comfortably, due to the habit of daily chair sitting” (Moore, 2009 pg. 105).
Mediation of stops allowed us the idea of both corporeal and mindful comfort; not having to worry when we would be able to ‘poo’, but also to many, where we would be able to ‘poo’. This particular discursive construction of the tourist acted to codify a specific, albeit banal touristic performance; minimising the possibilities of risk associated with this particular audience. The operators recognised that “even the most delineated social performance must be [able to be] re-enacted in different conditions and its reception may be unpredictable” (Edensor, 2007 pg. 204). Thus the organisation, via the tour director, consciously acted to construct and manipulate bodily rhythms.

### 6.6 Summary

Undoubtedly the mobile performance of the tour constructs everyday routines, rhythms and habits. It is important to acknowledge the impact these particular rhythms have in working towards the mythologizing of tourism as exotic disruptions that become a punctuation mark to the mobile rhythms of the day. Disruptions to the itinerary, were planned. a performance of structure through the imposition of institutional dictates (meeting timetables, fulfilling consumer obligations and contractual needs with hotels, museums and the like). However, these were counterbalanced by the unplanned, unstructured and often embodied disruption to planned rhythms of (im)mobility. Often, on the surface at least, unplanned disruptions were perceived as spontaneous and in some cases serendipitous – for example the unplanned stop at the roadside toilet (and the authentic encounter in local space and place).

Yet there were also strategies employed by the organisation that worked to mitigate unplanned disruptions in advance. Through specific rhetorical devices the tour director managed (or attempted to manage) community behaviour. Nevertheless, these performances, often rather than minimising disruption, acted to challenge the cohesiveness of the group and the tour director. The construction of the mobile community is inherently a performative outcome and it is such disruptions
(reconstructed as routines) that worked to solidify the community. It is through the repetitive performance of everyday practices that over time, rather than becoming backdrop to our daily lives became a defining feature of the social ordering of the mobile community. My attention now turns to the relationships between everyday life on the road and the construction and performance of identity.
Chapter Seven: **Identity and everyday life on tour**

### 7.1 Introduction

In the previous three chapters I represented a personalised (reflexive) account of a group tour, given context through the performance of the minutiae of daily life on and off the road. By highlighting (my) particular encounters and performances with social actors (both human and more-than-human) my intention was to produce a narrative account of a journey through which I could make sense of and subsequently re-present a reflexive self.

However, rather than the narrative being primarily a source of disembodied data for analysis at some point after exiting the field, the narrative(s) are a re-presentation of a social-self, me. Writing down (and up) and thinking about these narratives has given me a way to explore the construction and performance of the multiple, often contested identities I perform not only whilst at home, but also when elsewhere. These included, amongst other identities the performance of self-as-researcher, as tourist and importantly as becoming and being a member of a mobile community.

Through necessity the previous chapters have progressed in a linear manner through time and space. As such they have, at times, covered similar themes. In this chapter I want to pull together the narrative threads of chapters four, five and six. In these chapters my focus was on the imagination, being and performing disruption. Given the objectives of this thesis my focus in this chapter is to discuss the underlying relationships between everyday life, and identity that have permeated these narratives. This includes the socio-spatial, the body and embodiment, community, and the work involved in forming and performing identity. I follow this with a discussion of the reflexive self – that is at the heart of the thesis.
7.1.1 Realities of daily life

Somewhat ironically, in looking at the everyday life of those in a mobile community I was to a greater or lesser extent working to immobilise the tourist identity. Although acknowledging corporeal mobility, I did not want to privilege the understanding of tourism as just the physical movement of people. Rather I wanted to challenge the taken-for-grantedness of tourist mobility. As such I needed to 'still' the body in order to highlight other, often diverse (im)mobiles, including 'things' that are produced and reproduced through(out) and by the daily life of the tourist.

In foregrounding the minutiae of daily life on tour I needed to problematise the daily life of the tourist as the (im)mobile body. This, of course, is something that institutions such as the tourism industry do not want made explicit as it raises the possibility of innate risk to one's body (and mind) through for example the consumption of others food - thus representing a challenge to one's ontological security. Whilst we might live in what Beck (Beck, 1992) considers a risk society and we often, through experiences such as tourism, actively and knowingly engage with risk, there remains the need to make sense of and exist in everyday life (Jones and Raisborough, 2007).

In reality we got sick (see chapter six); we learned of and had to deal with issues back-home such as SARS; we needed to visit supermarkets and other such spaces in which one might recognise global brands but which were simultaneously places where "everything [felt] alien and frightening" (Davidson, 2003b, pg. 60). However, such spaces and places of the everyday lives of the toured other - for example fast food stores as well as pubic toilets were areas from which we were shielded, and actively discouraged from using - they formed no part of the tourist imaginary.

The Grand Bazaar, as a supposed space of everyday life, was undoubtedly full of colour, vibrancy, noise and smells as described in the tour brochure. However it was a -priori tourist spaces. I had already preconfigured my actions through the imaginary. I had,
through the tour brochure and subsequently the tour guide, learnt how to haggle. I had been pre-socialised. Such spaces and places have, over time, moved from being spaces of everyday life of the ‘other’ to primarily spaces for tourist consumption. Everyday places and spaces “become tourist places when they are attributed particular meanings and values, which appeal to and attract tourists” (Young, 1999, pg. 373), and as with the tour brochure, the reality is sanitised of any risk to the identity of the tourist-as-consumer. Conversely, the mundane performance of shopping at home stood in stark contrast to encounters whilst shopping in the supermarket of the toured ‘other’. Global brands of washing powder took on new resonance when I could not read the label. Rather than the exotic being my pre-tutored, pre-imagined consumptive experience of shopping in the Grand Bazaar; suddenly what would normally be considered mundane became the truly exotic.

In order to work through and understand these spaces of everyday life I needed to pay attention to, make visible and (re)sensitise myself to the multiple selves of the (im)mobile subject. As such in order to achieve the objectives of the thesis (see chapter one) I have needed to reflect upon the multiple identities and performances of self that occurred during the performance of the FIGT, which I now discuss.

7.2 Identity and the individual

There is a tendency for the multiplicity of selves of the so-called tourist to remain hidden "in the shadows of the dominant models in the [tourism] literature" (Dyck, 2005, pg. 234). Nevertheless there are different aspects to our identities and how we perform them and indeed see ourselves. However, rather than thinking of the idea of multiple identities as some form of ‘schizophrenic’ performance, I want to suggest identity as a set of complex, and in the case of this thesis, mobile performances (Williams and Patten, 2006).
Identity, on tour, did not happen merely through tourism as an exotic praxis. It equally, if not more importantly, happened through a (conscious and affective) reconfiguring of everyday life on the road. Thus through efforts by the self and others to ensure ontological security, multiple identities intersected (and coexisted) through the mediation and remediation(s) of daily life.

It has been suggested the tourist is a metaphor for our time (Dann, 2002, Urry, 1990), often a representation of the negatives associated with late modernity; a product, for example, of globalising forces. However this is to reify identity - it is to suggest that the modern individual unproblematically (and certainly unreflexively) performs the tourist as a clearly defined identity that exists outside the exigencies of wider socio-spatial influences. As such identifying the individual-as-tourist, and the identity of the self-as-tourist is often taken as self-explanatory (Schorch and Hakiwai, 2014).

Performing the tourist (as identity practice) however, can be seen to be about (re)negotiating the routes of tourism (Clifford, 1997). From watching and interpreting travel shows on television; reading lifestyle travel magazines to flicking through a travel brochure, one consumes a multitude of images which in turn mediates and remediates the tourist imaginary. A consequence of this is that whilst one is performing the consumer and the 'other' they are also actively (and socially) constructing (multiple) subjectivities (Silk, 2010). As such, within the tourism literature there is more often than not a focus on the essentialised touring subject. The tourist is made visible, for example, in the construction of images that mediate a specific preconfiguring of one's identity; whether they be used for representational (ideological) purposes in tourist brochures or those (often similar) images captured through the camera lens whilst we are elsewhere - away from 'home'. Here there is an explicit valorisation (and privileging) of, at the macro social level, the relationship between one's identity (as tourist) and economic benefit (the value that tourism can extract as an institution). However the micro-social, those performances, encounters and interactions that are complicit in the construction and
performance of identity in everyday life, remain in play during the fully inclusive group tour.

7.3 Space, identity and the individual

Understanding the topology of the tourist experience is important in understanding identity (see e.g. Theory, Culture and Society 29 4-5). This is no simple matter however, as it is suggested that if we regard tourism as a form of mass leisure (Cresswell, 2012), then it does not "help to give us a sense of identity" (Argyle, 1992). Therefore, one's identity as singularly the tourist (or for that matter the consumer) is at best ambiguous. In locating tourism as an institution, our understandings of the individual's identity are often limited to how marketers and destination managers situate the tourist into easily definable market segments based on travel and consumption patterns. Thus it might be suggested that institutionally, tourism in fact represses (constrains/restricts) identity through the performance of daily life. For example, the brochure worked (and continues to work) to preconfigure the individual as an imagined tourist. It informed me 'how to be the tourist' through a complex amalgam and subsequent mediation of commodified everyday life.

One's identity can be regarded as inherently (and inevitably) an outcome of the social production of space (Lefebvre, 1991). It is inextricably tied up to the construction of who we are and how others see us (and encounter us). There remains, however, the suggestion that identities are pre-formed and performed. As such when we leave behind our everyday lives at home, when we are elsewhere, our identity becomes rather simplistically that of the tourist. However, this is to privilege tourism as the realm of the corporeally mobile individual, with the suggestion that to travel (and be the tourist) one must physically move 'away' from home to be 'elsewhere'. Moreover, this is to play into the binaries of Cartesian space and identity, such as home and away, host and guest. Thus one cannot perform the tourist at home. However as I have shown (see chapters
four and five), there are multiple mobilities at play in tourism, not the least of which is the imagination. It was the co-production of the brochure as a socio-space that influenced my ability to become a part of the mobile community. As such the socio-spatial transforms (one can be a tourist at home whilst also being at 'home' whilst elsewhere) the subject.

Identity exists in the imagination – but it is also something that is embodied. When thinking about identity on tour, the body could not be ignored. The body acted as a boundary between identities, both my own and others. There was what might be considered a 'betweenness' in both the imagined and subsequent realities of the performance of identity. Rather than a binary distinction between tourist - other (and indeed researcher), the confluence of touristic space and performance (including of everyday life) "provide[d] the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood - singular or communal - that initiate[d] new signs of identity" (Bhabha, 1994). In the following section I attend to that which is often relegated to corporeal movement – the body of the individual.

7.3.1 Touring Bodies

An important part of my earlier discussions was the relationship between the (im)mobile body and the tourist-in-becoming (see chapter five). The importance of the body in constructing and performing identity should not be understated. In considering the body one begins to problematise the individual, researcher or tourist, as primarily a discursive construction.

The brochure preconfigured, through discursive techniques, the subject as the imagined tourist and in turn, informed the way one should 'be' or perform as the (institutionally) appropriate tourist. That being said, in exploring daily life on tour I became attuned to, or more prosaically re-sensitised, to the embodied and sensual performances of identity performance(s).
Throughout the FIGT our bodies were implicated in numerous touristic (im)mobilities; from the supposed immobile body aboard the coach transiting between tourist sights/sites, whilst simultaneously moving through and gazing upon the toured ‘others’ space, to our walking in ‘others’ everyday places. However, just taking into account mobilities such as these is to gloss over the micro-mobilities that went towards identity performances. As I have shown in chapters five and six, although there is an appearance of stillness on-board the coach, what might often considered mundane, became on reflection, those complex often sensuous rhythms which were central to daily life on and off the coach. From the sounds of the coach tyres on the road, the collective awakenings as we approached another disruption, to the culturally laden and symbolic washing of hands with lemon, the coach itself became a space for the co-production of selves as mobile, embodied and affective bodies.

Disruptions to the movement of the coach such as comfort stops (re)mobilised particular embodied identity practices - we awoke, stretched, and reimagined what it was to again be the tourist body. We collected our cameras and daypacks, stepping off the coach as the tourist. It was such conflagration of mobility and stillness that acted to ‘other’ those whose place and everyday lives we transited through. It was our collective and individual (im)mobilities that acted to interiorise us as the mobile community. As our bodies transited through ‘others’ space or we gazed out the coach window to when we, as a group, moved through tourist sites, we affectively and effectively exteriorised (all) others.

The embodied, and subsequently sensory and affective perception of daily life on tour influenced experiences of the social world. Such awareness to daily life challenged representation and revealed knowledge that words (and discourse) alone could not. For example, inter-corporeal relations (Hodge, 2005) influenced and regulated my identity as inter-subjectively constructed community member. Rather than merely linguistic competence, it was my and others bodies that informed identity. My movements through
the bus - from how I initially (didn’t) claim space/a seat, to the complex choreographies when we negotiated (shared) space on alighting at the tourist site. Such embodied manoeuvrings enabled us to makes sense of the proximities and intimacies (see chapter five) that would not necessarily occur in 'public' space. Much of our everyday (personal) life is carried out away from the scrutiny of others - here, in close proximity to those 'others', and for extended periods of time, one was unable to perform in the same way as during normal daily life. One mechanism that was used in order to facilitate or negotiate these performances (at the core of our ontological security) was to interiorise the group - in effect to create a close knit community (family). Discussions within this collective could then take on the intensely personal - thus toilets and toilet stops became a common topic of discussion - how much was the loo (was it free was the important one, see plate 7.1), was there someone in the toilet to give oil as one left.

Everyday life was not only mediated within the body, but also the affective capacities of daily life upon our bodies. My own sense of belonging was made problematic by the clothes I wore (or didn't wear). At least initially my clothing conformed to those of imagined tourist mediated through the tour brochure (see chapter four). At this point I was trying through whatever means at my disposal, not to stand apart from others on the tour. I dressed as I thought others would, as I needed to be accepted (Miller, 2009b), in order to carry out research as the insider. However, this was made problematic when I realised I had not packed clothing for cold weather; ironically this played into the construction, by others, of my identity as a New Zealander.
Although the brochure informed us how to perform the tourist, aspects of life at home (whilst on the road) are not mentioned - washing clothes, morning coffee, taking a shower. There is an assumption that these mundane aspects of daily life will be managed and dealt with. In reality, the performance of the tour director was important in the (re)configuring of our (embodied) daily life. At the start of the tour management of a key part of everyday life, washing clothes was (re)mediated when we were informed, “that there is no need to wash clothes as we will be stopping at markets where the clothes are cheap”. Again we are configured as the all-consuming ‘western’ body with an assumption that we have the requisite economic capital needed to continually purchase clothing. There is naturally a link between the symbolic characteristics of clothing and one’s identity. However, for me, clothes were more than superficial to identity and the body. They also became an embodied performance, one through which I performatively enacted ‘home’ and which anchored me in place.


7.3.2 Researching bodies

It is important to acknowledge that it is through the body that the corporeally mobile subject experiences. Whilst I had thought about the body prior to entering the field, it was only through reflecting on day-to-day life that I realised the possibilities the body offered to my construction of knowledge. This realisation encouraged me to engage with the (im)mobile body as a research tool. After all it was my researcher body that was following the touring body and wider assemblage and it was through this body that I could make sense of the world I was (temporarily) inhabiting (Buscher et al., 2010).

I thus wanted to acknowledge and bring the body 'back' to my research (Spry, 2001). After all, my researcher's body was implicated in understanding the tourist's body. Not only was my body located in the field (Longhurst et al., 2008), but also co-located with those with whom I constructed a mobile community as tourist. My bodily routines and rhythms of daily life as tourist and researcher necessarily intersected. Whether it was eating, sitting next to Vera or my proximity to others in the coach, walking in the group through other places or going to the toilet, my embodied performance impacted on my ability to carry out research as well as to determine what data actually was and how I might collect it. The body then, was central to my research, from perceived contradictions of mobility and stillness through to the affect of disruptions upon the performance of identity.

Without doubt the body matters. Not merely as part of identity performance associated with being a tourist but also in being the researcher. For me, this was important in understanding how one's body, both discursively and materially, carried and communicated amongst other aspects, self and otherwise inscribed identities. As such, a contemporary politics of identity demands (and draws) attention to the body as both occupying space but also to the role of the body in the social construction of space. Over time materialities such as the journal, the daypack and camera became a representation...
of the researching and touring body. Material considerations impacted on the blurring of identity between my research body and tourist body.

Tourist materialities externally mediated my identity as tourist, but they also became an embodied performances - the camera/bag/pack more than just a part of, became my body. Identity was performed through the performance and non-performance of my body. One brings notice to the ‘self’ through differently performed bodies. For example, my researcher self was highlighted when I did not get off the coach at the first stop (see chapter five). During the tour my body became a vector for emotions and affect, of the research process potentially going wrong before it had really started. It also brought home to me that whilst I had planned, imagined and thought through my entry to the field, my reactions to particular experiences were of a body and mind in conflict. Whilst my mind attempted to rationalise why I was thinking and acting the way I was - my body also mediated a sense of touristic anxiety and helplessness (see chapter five). I had, to all intents and purposes, bought into the imaginary, where the risks I was experiencing would not happen. Whilst my mind had entered the field through the blurring of the research and tourist imaginary - the reality left a lot to be desired.

On the surface such examples of the body, everyday life and identity appear to represent the mundane. It is because of this that they are an essential part of how relationships (and identity) emerge and are articulated through the connections between embodiment, subjectivity and spatial and material practices. Illness, hugs and tears changed the interactions between us (and at times acted to bring back together the diverging community as I now discuss (and see chapter six)). Our performance of daily life was inherently, if unreflexively, embodied - it was also an everyday that we brought with us on tour, it came as baggage within as well as on us.
7.4 Community and identity (mobilising community)

In this section I want to talk about the relationships between identity and communal relationships on the tour. My focus here is on the tourist (and my tourist self). This is important in the context of this thesis because as Argyle (, pg. 38) suggests, "relationships are central to the main activities of everyday life, of work and leisure".

Being a tourist is a situated accomplishment. As individuals we sought to communicate a particular impression to those around us (Scott, 2009). Of course the impression many, i.e. academics (McKean, 1989, Aramberri, 2010) and other consumers (Obrador-Pons et al., 2009a), have of those who travel in the tour group is often negative; of group tours as a form of mass tourism and thus to be resisted. However, this is to dismiss the nuanced identity performance of the group as community. It was through complex imaginings that identity (and self) was managed. As Scott (2009. pg. 15), contends; “we [did] not simply deal with the immediacies of each encounter, but rather link[ed] these together in our minds to create a sense of meaning, purpose and identity over time”. Our imagined identities were made real and challenged through interactions with those in the mobile community. Initially, the tour community was based on a shared imagined identity, preconfigured through engagement with media such as TV and tourist brochure. This imaginary, along with previous tour group experiences, formed the interaction ritual chains (Collins, 2004), which facilitated both performance of self and community to come.

During this initial (re)configuration of the group into community, we were forming what Goffman (1963b) terms an ‘institution of acquaintanceship’. We cognitively recognized each other whereby “one individual “places” or identifies another, linking the sight of him [sic] with a framework of information concerning him [sic]” (pg. 113). We effectively acknowledged each other as and through symbolic representations from the tourist brochure (hence my wanting to wear a jacket as I had seen in the brochure).
An important part of traveling as a tour group was the dynamic of the group itself. In thinking about how others and I initially went about forming the community, the dominant conversation was one of claiming cultural identity. Our sharing where we had 'come from' was a defining characteristic of initial encounters. Whilst on the surface a simple (everyday) interaction, it is a complex performance. However, in claiming I am a New Zealander or my seatmate was English is to simplify the contested nature of identity, citizenship and belonging. As Ahluwalia suggests, (2007, pg. 257)

[in] generalized (even constitutive) dislocation, questions of origin are no longer amenable to straightforward answers. 'Where are you from? and 'what is your mother-tongue?' are questions which for many can no longer be answered in the singular, if they can be answered at all. Indeed, notions of a linguistic, cultural and geographic 'home' are increasingly difficult either to conceptualise or inhabit existentially.

Of course the imaginary had placed all our fellow group members as "new friends". Communitas however, is constructed on more than a singular response to such mediations. It is built over time and the opening up of one's self(s) occurs as the processes of socialisation occur. For example, I subsequently found that whilst Ian was a former Australian Federal Police Officer, he had also spent time seconded to the United Nations in Cyprus. Tran; a doctor from Australia, was not only Australian but also Malay. This in turn challenged notions of proximity and distance that occur in groups of unknown individuals.

7.4.1 Through difference comes community

The affect of proximities and performances including rituals such as collecting cameras or having our hands washed with lemon ‘alcohol’ by the tour director resulted in a sense of cohesion. As such, one’s own ideas were to a greater or lesser extent subsumed; where for example, status barriers of class and status were if not broken down they were at least blurred (Brown, 2011). Whilst I could guess at accents and social position, our
physical co-presence to each other meant that initially at least and in order to maintain civility we were forced to interact.

One’s identity was subject to how we defined ourselves relative to those whom surrounded us. Both collectively and individually our identity was noticeably different to those through whose places and space we toured. However, I would suggest it is the culture of consumption that also blurred the distinctions between oneself and others on and in the FIGT. Our performance as tourists assumed a shared consumer identity. We had, for example, been informed that most of our everyday lives on tour was to be performed as distinct from the local community; i.e. we had tourists toilets. Furthermore we also performed in ways that created symbolic differences between us and other tour groups. We wanted to demonstrate that we had a different (collective) identity to other groups (Argyle, 1992). For example in not 'following the umbrella' we performed distinction in turn marking us as different to the touring others.

Moreover, our exteriorising of others as well as other groups was also performed through representations both off and on the coach. Not only did our identity diverge based on age and clothing but also on how we distinguished our mobile ‘home’, for example our collective antipathy to the Contiki tour.

Through such performance we externally performed community - our attempt to perform differently to other groups gave us a stronger sense of (collective and individual) identity. In recognising the differences of these others we were also disassociating our community and ourselves from these other tours (Scott, 2009). Somewhat paradoxically we were performing an embodied resistance to negative connotations of other FIGT’s. It was as if we ourselves forgot we were also a part of this

---

41 Many of the other tours had ‘guides’ who led with a raised umbrella which the tour participants followed.
form of tourism.

There are complex negotiations between material (mobile) culture and the individual in constructing identity (Elliott and Urry, 2010). Community was not only an outcome of the humans that surrounded us but also the more-than-human. Our coach itself played a performative part in the construction and performance of identity, both individually and collectively. Somewhat paradoxically, the coach itself was socially constructed as a means of group self-identification. It achieved this through for example branding, for us as consumers however also stood (and moved) as a space in which we construct and performed our-selves as other-than-consumer.

### 7.4.2 Community and space

Of course context is important in understanding identity practices. Not merely at the level of understanding daily life on tour, but also in the context of the multiple 'scapes' brought into play; for example the coach as a consumer 'scape'. Here, the coach (tour) has historically been thought of as a "place where consumption occurs", as a space where we might understand "the interactions surrounding consumption, and the shared meanings circulating within [such] contexts" (Brown, 2011, pg. 125). However, whilst the coach may be perceived as a space of (consumer) consumption it was also practiced and lived as something else.

On the surface, and as suggested in the previous section, both symbolically and materially the coach (as social object) acted to configure identity and everyday life outcomes. The coach acted as a site of identity performance in both a positive way to the group as a site of community and dwelling, but also negatively as when viewed as symbolic of mass tourism (Obrador-Pons et al., 2009a). However, given that the coach is a social space it is open to reconfiguration, possibly as a site of resistance.
Certainly in thinking about the coach as a dwelling space, our performances were negotiated and performed through institutional requirements. In order to ensure the equitable sharing of space we moved seats each day. This was outlined by the tour director on the first day and was also policed by those who had been on previous tours. In doing so, whilst one could claim the coach, the individual could not claim the seat as one’s own. Of course this appears banal (and that is the point) - but it meant that we had to move and reconfigure space each day. Where would we leave our camera bags, day packs, journals and other accoutrements of the daily life of the tourist and researcher? We were unable to make space 'personal'; rather it remained communal. Likewise, whilst we claimed our coach as meaningful space, often the coaches of others were talked of disparagingly. As the brochure exhorted we were not just on a group tour, but an *Insight Tour*.

I purchased the tour not only as a researcher, but also, and importantly, as a consumer. Paying in advance allowed me to fundamentally change the way in which others and I made use of the coach and worked on constructing community. For us the performance of the consumer - the financial transaction, came prior to meeting - allowing us to bypass performances of self-as-consumer. In removing the spectre of commercial transactions the coach affectively produced a “common ground for sociability and conflict” it became “terrain for the dialogical and dialectical practices” of community and belonging (Irazábal, 2008, pg. 24). The coach therefore became *more than* the outcome of a commercial transaction. Rather than a mode of transport between tourist sites/sights, it became reconfigured as a kind of mobile 'home'. It became a place of refuge from the work of being the tourist (see chapter six). It became a place for the sharing, of stories and self. The interactions were between selves as more-than-consumers.

Constructing and performing identity (along with constructions of space) created performative punctuation marks (Bissell et al., 2012). For example, the performances involved in coming to the comfort stop reconfigured one as (at least initially) the tourist.
However it was also about how the group worked to (re)configure both individual and collective performances that made up the tour as communal practice. This included not just the corporeal mobility of the tour; activities such as museums, walking through spaces and eating but also spaces and performances of stillness such as sleeping.

### 7.4.3 Performing community

The mobile community was an ordered space - one had a role to play. There was an expectation, by (the majority of) others that role performance would be maintained (Goffman, 1971a). In attempting to perform other than the tourist by marking assignments and failing to get off the coach at the first tourist site (see chapter five) I had performed an inappropriate identity. This had a profound effect. I quickly realised that in order to be a part of a community I had to play by 'their' rules. Even though I had read the brochure in detail and had been told 'how to be' the tourist, I thought I could act differently. Scott (2009, pg97) succinctly sums up my predicament when she suggests "unsupported identity claims embarrass actors who have tried to present themselves as one thing but are exposed as something else". That being said, the questions I was asked as others came on board did allow me to divulge my dual role as group member and researcher).

The challenge of performing appropriately was an issue I faced during the formative period of the community in becoming. In hindsight, part of my need to talk to everyone was not merely the surface performance of my researcher self (ingesting as much data as possible), but rather my need to be accepted as a part of the group or community in becoming. This is of course, essential as a complete member researcher. However, there was again a blurring of identity where I felt the need for "self-esteem and ego-identity, which comes from being liked and accepted by others" (Scott, 2009, pg. 47).

### 7.4.4 Divergent community (and coming together again)

The tour group as a mobile community was undoubtedly a result of an openness to be
being affected by the presence of everyday life. There was a 'sense' of community about the tour. The community was manifest in the affect of our selves and bodies on the social structure of the community through our situated action(s). The community was a representation of what our selves and bodies did (Fine, 2005). However, this was open to contestation and particular performances illustrated a divergent community. Whilst we worked on community, we did not necessarily always perform communitas.

Over the period of the FIGT we, as social actors, avoided interaction in spite of our close proximity (Pütz, 2012). There was, at times, a messiness to the temporary community. Proximity during the tour is both unavoidable and a necessity, it results in the social engagement that forms communal bonds (Goffman, 1967), however it is also problematic as there is little escape from that proximity. For example, the two youngest members (Emma and Lucy) had recently graduated from university (both with medical degrees) and had spent time backpacking and "wandering around looking for an identity" (Argyle, 1992). Such self-sufficiency, along with economic capital (unexpected by others) led to their non-performance of community. Over time a regular topic of conversation on the coach (when stopped at a tourist site and the two were elsewhere) was the ability of these 'young' people to purchase expensive carpets and then spend more on pottery and art. Such discordant conversations were however, subject to the vagaries of our subject bodies.

Affect is as Fine (2005), suggests “the engine of social order”. A case in point is the illness that hit a number of us (as discussed in chapter six). The affect of this on the group was an outcome of the emotional energy created (Collins, 2004). Any dis-engagement or divergence of individuals from the community was halted. Interactions and conversations (re)turned to the care of others. Some, whom I had over the previous two days only really conversed with in passing, as Goffman’s ‘acquaintances’, were now offering me their medication. Indeed, the rhythms of the tour were collectively changed (and charged) in order to the ensure comfort of the afflicted. The emotional energy not
only motivated individuals (Fine, 2005), but also affected the community through strengthening communitas.

From the period of illness on, ritual performances associated with our daily lives, for example saying hello to each other over breakfast, or when checking our bags onto the coach, took on a new and emotive resonance. Performances such as confirming our suitcases (see plate 7.7) were implicated in (re)mediating the solidarity of the community. When I became ill I became isolated from everyday life. I understood how it “felt if you had run out of aspirin and if you had had to wait one week to get medicated” (Vannini, 2012, pg. ??). At this point I was inundated by offers of medication by those around me (along with various tales of illness and discomfort). Such actions illustrate the blurred boundaries between our group as a collective of tourists, for example as community of practice, and our shared (everyday) coexistence. In these performances there was a valuing of the affect on the community that arose from intersubjective interaction and encounters.

It was through these intersubjective experiences that the imagined community was challenged. In the tour brochure the group was represented as fundamentally one-dimensional (Day 2006 pg 288). In reality we were united through identity practice as both simultaneously and alternating between, *gemeinschaft* (community) and *geselleschaft* (association).

Intersubjectivity (see chapter 2) is central to the construction of knowledge within this thesis. To me, as Gillespie et al (2010, pg. 19) suggest, "intersubjectivity is central to social life", going further to "conceptualise it as the variety of relations between perspectives" of both individuals and groups. As such, intersubjectivity not only became a way to think about verbal encounters - but also to think through the dialogic possibilities of other forms of encounter with those around me, including for example, the bodily proximities of others. How others responded and interacted with me was not
limited to verbal discourse but also encompassed gazes, touch (washing hands) and smell and sound. Intersubjectivity was also central to my understanding of who I was becoming, and the roles I was performing. After all community is, as Crossley (1996, pg. 153) argues, “necessarily an interworld, and intersubjective space” and as such “the ontology of community and membership...is necessarily an intersubjective ontology”.

My attempts to work on the coach for example, showed a lack of intersubjective awareness. However in thinking critically (at the time) about this, it gave me a heightened sense of awareness of the importance of intersubjectivity in forming the mobile community as well as becoming attuned to and understanding the multiple selves I and others were performing (an outcome of this was an inability to switch off as I moved from one identity to another in internal dialogue at night). I thus became attuned to how others might perceive (of) me (Bird, 2003), and in turn how I represented my social self (selves) to others both in and outside of the tour group.

There has been the suggestion that in late modernity we face a crisis of community, occurring as a result of neoliberalism, but also due in part to contemporary mobilities (Colic-Peisker, 2010). Moreover, the purported end of community might be seen as a dominant narrative in the mediation of the tour itself. However, rather than a post-modern grasp for an idyllic community of the past this tour has confirmed to me that the both the idea and reality of community continues to exist. In fact, tourism itself offers possibilities as a space conducive to the notion of community, at both macro and micro scale. In the context of this tour we were, as Gardiner (2004, pg.156) might suggest, "participants in portable communities [where we collectively and individually created] spaces for intimate and inclusive gemeinschaft social interaction that [many of us] find lacking in [our] daily lives". Those of us on tour might be considered as having performed as a 'cloakroom' community - where the context of community is regarded as being invisible to those outside the group (Bauman, 2007). One might certainly suggest this applies to those who disparage this form of travel (as I once did). However, such
(cloakroom) "communities are patched together for the duration of the spectacle" (Bauman and Vecchi, 2004, pg. 31) which might suggest that ours was dismantled once the suitcases were collected from the coach for the final time and we said our ‘goodbyes’.

Packing and unpacking became the motif for a (the possibilities and see plate 7.10) mobile life made real. Unpacking becomes a symptom of modern malaise - rather than travel sickness I now become ill with the thought of stillness. I continue to live out of a suitcase even though I have returned. The visible suitcase becomes symbolic of hoped-for-mobilities. Not so much as an escape form the here and now, rather the suitcase represents an imagined everyday life. The suitcase becomes part of my be-longing in space and time.

Plate 7.2 Precarious Mobilities

Of course, in the case of this tour the members (us) formed a community around a
specific performance, the tour. However, I would go further to suggest that the FIGT can also be viewed as a 'cocoon' community (Korpela and Dervin, 2013) in that it differs from (in a temporal sense) the cloakroom community through technological advances and the suggestion of a (social) need for reciprocity. Friendships (whether temporary or longer lasting) had been formed through proximities and intimacies and played out through, for example, the sharing of Christmas cards and entries to the online journal (made use of by the organisation at a later date!).

7.5 Working at identity

Our construction and performance of identity did not happen without work. The tour is a manifestation of, as Urry (1990 pg. 22) suggests, “the ability to buy time, that is the ability to avoid work or to replace it with other kinds of work”. There was work involved in consuming tourist products and services. The FIGT is a space "where it is clear that converting a range of tourist services into a satisfactory 'holiday' involve[d] a great deal of work. This work involve[d] both the grouping itself determined to have a good time" and ultimately in the ability to (corporeally) mobilise one's self.

It took work to (re)produce and subsequently consume the realisation of the imaginary. This was apparent in the affective work needed to establish one’s place/position within the community. For example, we had to necessarily exert ourselves in the performance of the face-work required when meeting new acquaintances (Goffman, 1967). It also took (our) labour to ensure the success of the tour as a commercial enterprise. We were not passive bodies; we co-produced the promised touristic experiences alongside those of daily life on the road.

Through the co-creative work of others, the tour organisation, past tourists and one’s self, the brochure acted both symbolically and performatively to negotiate the space
between the tourist-in-becoming and the tourist-in-being. Not only did travelling elsewhere potentially disrupt our ability to perform everyday life, but also our to our ability to perform identity. As Scott (2009, pg. 71) argues "disruptions [to] the taken for granted make us feel uncomfortable by challenging our sense of personal identity and social reality, and so we are reluctant to acknowledge them". In the FIGT it was the (hidden) work invested in maintaining daily life that was of importance. Here the brochure came into its own.

Being a tourist as well as being a researcher made me aware of how one’s internal dialogue(s) (Cunha and Gonçalves, 2009) can disrupt the patterns and routines of daily life that are essential to ontological security. Prior to leaving ‘home’ the imaginary I had constructed, through engagement with the tour brochure, acted to mitigate possible ruptures to my everyday life. This was achieved through representations of a commodified everyday life on tour (see chapter 4). Representations (and subsequent imaginings) abounded of modern cultures of consumption (Lury, 1996). However, this rather imaginatively hid from view the work involved in everyday life on tour, in turn furthering the myth of tourism as escape from everyday life.

### 7.6 Reflections on ‘self’ – between researcher and tourist

Whilst in the previous sections I have been discussing identity more generally, in this section of the chapter I want to refocus my attention upon the (my) reflexive, researcher self. This necessarily involves re-visiting aspects of my methodological position and the interactionist ‘me’ (Denzin, 2009, Atkinson and Housley, 2003).

I came to this thesis with no clear idea of who I actually was; certainly I was not sure of where I belonged. I have had a somewhat peripatetic life. Certainly at times it has seemed as if I have been an observer of my life rather than an active participant. Ironically this has been of some benefit in the course of this thesis, and especially in my
efforts to be reflexive. In this section, I want to discuss the mediation and performance of identity in the context of both daily life on tour and wider everyday life within which fieldwork and my life worlds’ existed.

In hindsight I was not a blank canvas when I began this thesis, neither as a researcher (see chapter three) nor tourist. People have travelled and researched for millennia and it is through a shared heritage, along with experiences of my own life world, that I had been, to a greater or lesser extent, socialised in performing the self as both tourist and researcher. It is without doubt that this research, along with the wider process of doing the thesis fundamentally changed me. It was (as I am sure with many others) a journey of self-discovery; but I had not initially envisaged this as an outcome. However, in attempting to (methodologically) deal with authorial transparency my identity was in turn destabilised. Of course I was aware that one's "self required critical situating" (Knowles et al., 2004, pg. 55). However, the thesis journey made clear the possibility of ontologies of the self/selves (Stanley, 1993) and how I had, prior to the thesis, unproblematically mobilised these both internally and in the external world around me.

Who I had been, who I was and who I was about to become were a recurrent stream of consciousness/thought. This (re)sensitised me to the importance of understanding not just others, but also my own life world and everyday experiences. It is in such reflexive spaces that Heidegger (1988) suggests "knowing is a mode of being of in-being". Such thinking is central to the possibility of a dialogic self (in becoming and being) which in turn "supports a dynamic view of selfhood and identity through which the subject is encouraged to recognise its own complexity and vulnerability, rather than external principles, as the basis for moral responsibility and action" (Piper, 2004, pg. 43). To ensure the dialogic (internal as well as towards the reader) nature of this thesis, what is of importance here is to understand how research affected my identity and in turn how identity affects (and affected) research. Of course, in a thesis such as this it highlights the
blurring between key identity practices; in this case between that of self-as-researcher and self-as-tourist.

To a greater or lesser extent, researching and writing from an reflexive ethnographic sensibility enabled me to problematise the relationship between researcher and tourist (Enevoldsen, 2003), where I was at once both researcher and tourist as well as complete member researcher (Anderson, 2006). Rather than merely following the touring subject I became the touring subject. Through becoming and being a tourist I was able to foreground - or bring to the light of day - those mundane, banal, quotidian practices that allow the tourist to perform the exotic and encounter difference. Furthermore, I was able to access the backstage of those identity practices that both inform and are informed by everyday life.

An outcome of engaging with such (reflexive) methodologies in research is having to deal with (dis)continuity of the self. This being my first ever group tour, as well as a new form of fieldwork, the novelty of the occasion itself played a part in self-change (Cunha and Gonçalves, 2009). In moving through and between spatial boundaries I became attuned to an "alterity of identity and meaning" (Kostogriz, 2006, pg. 184). Not only the (often) unproblematic ‘othering’ of those whom inhabit the spaces tourists (and researchers) travel through; but also my previous conception of having (had) a stable identity was made problematic. My everyday life was made up of performances that were at once the same and yet different to others in the community.

Much of my thinking now is about how my writing and analysing is in itself complicit in a form of Levinasian alterity. I had to necessarily other my tourist self in order to engage my researcher self – an act in itself, almost a transcendence of identity, where understanding enabled a critical reflection of self. Such "self-reflection is vital in reflexive ethnographic research as it provides a viewing window on the conduct of the researcher" (Lang, 2012, pg. 22). Lang goes on to argue that the "first ethical step towards research
engagement begins with the researcher's engagement with self and that this introspection must continue throughout the research process. In this way the researcher remains alive to their processes of navigating the liminal spaces between cultures” (Lang, 2012, pg. 23).

7.6.1 Performing with/as other

Whilst I shared intimate stories with individuals in the group, my knowledge of them as well as others around me could only ever be fragmented and partial (Taylor, 2011). Given our close proximity, empathetic relations and friendships were developed (and are maintained). These in turn shaped my identity, performance and subsequently data both in the field and on my return home (Coffey, 1999). It is important that I acknowledge this as these relations had a fundamental impact not only on encounters and my understanding of what was happening around me (data) but also in who was collecting data.

Co-constructing the coach as a form of mobile dwelling (at least for the majority of the day) naturally created opportunities for the blurring of spatially and temporally bound relationships, intimacies and thus identities. As a result of proximity, my relations with others around me transcended the space of both tourism and the academy (Cann and DeMeulenaere, 2012). Conversations with Vera and others wound between what we were experiencing as tourists, what I was doing as a researcher and my and others lives outside of the tour. As a result many of those around me became co-researchers, and thus complicit in the search for knowledge itself.

Even after my period of fieldwork was completed and I had returned home I found my performance of identity remained, to a greater or lesser extent, ambiguous. As Salzaar (2011, pg. 171) notes; "tourism creates relations in a world hitherto unconnected, creating a new expanding universe. Connections are made and unmade that reach beyond the specificity of time and place." I have since received numerous emails from
many of those with whom I travelled including, photographs that many had taken during the trip, along with their comments hoping that they would help me in my thesis. Some took images of me being the researcher (see image ??), Others took images of me being a tourist, whilst some took photographs of me performing everyday life (image at breakfast). Vera, for example, took a photograph of me conversing with the tour director - in actuality showing me acting outside of the community, breaking ranks if you will and challenging my supposed insider status.

As such there was not only a blurring of my own identity practices, where others performances and representations acted to illustrate my own vacillation between researcher and tourist - but also as a consequence my own research resulted in these individuals themselves (reflexively) performing as researchers rather than tourists illustrating the messiness of identity work. This is important as it shows that everyday performances supersede the performance of the tourist as a singular actor. Rather the plurality of the social actor (Lahire, 2009) was made apparent.
Understanding the fluidity of performance challenged my previous understanding of being inside or outside. At times I was neither insider nor outsider but simultaneously both. As Taylor (2011, pg. 6) suggests, "one can never assume totality in their position as either an insider or as an outsider, given that the boundaries of such positions are always permeable". That being said, experiences such as not getting off the coach clearly showed the binary of insider/outsider that existed as a part of the tour group. I had rejected (gave up) performing the tourist. At least initially whilst coming to terms with my positionality I was neglecting the power involved in claiming (and performing) identity.
At times I became troubled by my own performance as both researcher and tourist. I often found myself wondering if I should be engaging so much with the tour director in a social sense. None of the others did, and in fact it became something that was discussed by others in the group; ‘why is Tolga asking questions’, why is he buying you drinks?’. Others telling me that the tour director is 'looking for you'. Some went as far as taking photographs. (see plate 7. 12) Not only is this illustrative of the tensions faced by the researcher as an insider/outsider (Adler and Adler, 1987), but also shows the conflicted role of the tour director. At times separate to us, for example when we were eating during comfort stops (see chapter 6), whilst at other times caring for example when washing our hands with scented oils as we resumed our journey. Of course these can be seen as part of the professional role of the tour guide and staged in order to ensure our satisfaction as consumers (Bowie and Chang, 2005). However, on reflection these were attempts by me to consciously perform as other-than-tourist, but also other-than-researcher. On speaking to Tolga at the end of the tour he commented that he had told his wife ‘there was a single male on the tour who was about [his] age and [he] would be able to ‘make a friend’.

7.6.2 Breaking up was hard to do

Being a researcher in the field as part of a group or community is by its nature temporary (Bornstein, 2007), as indeed is that of the tourist as part of a tour group. However, given the relations I have previously discussed, removing myself from the field came with its own particular issues (and indeed angst, see e.g. (Taylor, 2011)). Over the period of the trip I had become involved, in some cases closely, with those around me. I was thus faced with detaching myself from both the community and the field. One of the difficulties I faced in writing up the fieldwork was thinking about the relationships I had (established) with others (Hall, 2009). Whilst this is something that is faced by many researchers it is implicit in understanding (and acknowledging) the reflexive self-as-researcher.

Over time I had created what might, on the surface, be considered casual informant
friendships (Taylor, 2011). As we came closer to the end of the tour I realised, after reflecting on changing topics of conversations, that in many cases my engagement with others, whilst certainly intersubjective and dialogical had been lacking in the sharing of certain intimate details. However, I was also aware of the emotions I was feeling and realised that in the tour group friendships were "one of the most important things about the entire experience" (Bruner et al., 1995, pg. 230). As we came nearer the end of the tour there was a universal sharing of details about family, work details, the sharing of plans dealing with the return home. Some within the community talked of calling children to ensure 'that home would be ready for them'. Others started talking of future plans. All of a sudden mobile phones were being used (within hearing of the rest of us) to contact home. Not only was this part of a process of getting ready to go home but also as part of a process of distancing from those we had created relationships with.

Importantly the performance of body (body work) became embodied and overtly emotional. On entering the group, more formal modes of greeting had been used, for example, the shaking of hands. However on departure 'goodbyes' became much more about affect, for example kissing and hugging. Farewells became embodied emotional performances (including crying) (see plate 7.13). More than merely a FIGT we were performing an embodied rupturing of close relations. There is an emotional cost to be paid when leaving a community. Whilst we had voluntarily entered the mobile community, and were supposedly free to leave, we had built bonds that were more than merely surface performances (Mezei and Briganti, 2013). We had shared everyday life; those seemingly banal yet often intensely personal aspects of our daily lives. Furthermore, whilst I might have been free to leave the community traces (and indeed performances) remain - from the sharing of images to the annual Christmas card to be sent and received.
7.7 Summary

My focus in this chapter has been to establish the links between identity and everyday life in the context of a FIGT. As I have discussed above, the performance of identity is complex. The social actor is never performing a singular identity (Lahire, 2011). One is never ‘only’ a/the tourist, nor for that matter, researcher. Although on the surface tourism is about leaving ‘home’, performing elsewhere and thus difference, we also through necessity reformulate everyday life. However this is not merely a commodified everyday life as imagined through engagement with media of various forms – for example the tour brochure or television travelogue. Rather everyday life on the road is replete with nuanced acts and activities. What initially might be regarded as unremarkable, when re-viewed show, at the micro-social level, the intricate relationships between everyday life and our performance(s) of self and identity. In the following chapter my attention (re)turns to the thesis more generally.
Chapter Eight: **Resituating a thesis**

### 8.1 Introduction - Resituating a thesis

In an academic context, the thesis is considered a rites de passage for the emerging researcher - an apprenticeship if you will. As a consequence there are acceptable ways of doing things. Given the nature of this thesis it is important to restate it is a reflexive ethnography. As such, rather than being situated on the periphery gazing in for knowledge, I was (and indeed remain) situated with others in the centre as subject (and see chapter seven for subjects as co-researchers).

Whilst of course I had to remain attuned to dominating the discussion, it is important to me that I emphasise the importance of knowledge as being co-constructed with an emphasis on the researcher's (my) interactionist 'self'. Knowledge in this thesis is therefore considered an output of my interactions and encounters, in both close proximity and at a distance (spatially and temporally), which in turn influenced my understanding of the life world in which I found (and indeed still find) myself.

The process of producing a thesis is undoubtedly a life-changing journey. However, it does not exist outside one’s other life worlds. It is, after all, affected by and in turn affects the lives of those who produce and co-produce the thesis; for example those who took part in the research, as well as significant others. Importantly for me however, whilst on the surface temporally situated, my thesis is inexorably bound up in the past, present and informs the (my) future and those that surround me.

In this concluding chapter, I do a number of things. Initially I reflect on the research objectives for my study to bring together the threads arising from theoretical debates (see for example chapters two and three) and interpretations garnered from the
empirical discussions (in Chapters Four, Five and Six). I will go on to reiterate that tourist identity is not an outcome of dramaturgical performance; rather that it is formed (co-constituted) through a performative assembly – a collection of embodied and affective performances. Moreover I will continue to argue that identity might arise not in the realms of tourism, as the supposed escape to an exoticised other space, rather identity is an outcome of an unfolding of, and reflexive engagement with, everyday life. I conclude the chapter by thinking forward and examining how this research might provide fertile ground for future tourism (and other) studies.

8.1.1 Regarding everyday life

The invocation of notions of the banal and mundane as the antithesis of how we might know tourist performance is to overlook what goes into making, performing and maintaining daily life away from home. It is often not until one considers everyday life in different contexts that one can begin to glimpse the complexities that make up day-to-day existence. The everyday is often seen as constraining (Gardiner, 2000), however, as I have shown, it is also the ephemeral, the emergent, the evanescent, the de-centered and the heterogeneous (Marcus and Saka, 2006).

In thinking about common understandings of tourism as being an escape from daily life, the mundane became an appropriate space of encounter and performance through which to re-contextualise and re-conceptualise everyday life. However rather than thinking of tourism as an antithesis of everyday life, mobilising (an) everyday life enabled me to recognise the complex performances that have been thought of as the mundane and banal activities of daily life.
8.2 Restating the research aims

For this thesis the fundamental 'question' was:

_How does the practice of everyday life performed away from home inform the construction of one's identity?_

Secondly, given my focus on a specific, socially constructed touristic space – the fully inclusive group tour, through the research I sought to understand:

_How the collective and individual experience of the tour as a socially constructed space mediated identity?_

When I first started this thesis I had wanted to suggest that by looking at the mundane and banal practices of everyday life we might better understand the (social) construction and performance of tourism. The outcome however, rather than focusing on tourism or the tourist, both of which provided (important) context, turned out to be about understanding identity performance and the negotiation of self through the mundane and banal aspects of daily life elsewhere.

In the previous chapter, I discussed the relationships between space, performance and identity whilst away from home on a FIGT. However, in the following discussion I want to (re)focus on how the research as reflexive performance but also as process, has informed responses to these exploratory questions.

8.2.1 Everyday life and identity

The focal point for my thinking when beginning this thesis was, and remains, the performance of everyday life. One knows (or at least hopes) that daily life continues for one’s self whilst elsewhere. However, in trying to understand tourist identity, there is little explicit discussion or analysis of everyday life. To do so would most certainly be to disrupt the ideal (and idea) of tourism as an escape. Rather than moving away from the
banal and mundane performances that make up our everyday lives at home such analysis would foreground banal practices. This would challenge a tourist imaginary where the dominant mediation is governed by representations of the extra-ordinary. After all, as Morgan and Watson (Morgan and Watson) argue, all tourism organizations have the same objective. That is to "provide consumers with something extraordinary, something which will stand out from everyday life..." (Morgan and Watson, 2009, pg. 116).

No matter the extent to which a discursive construction of the tourist is based on an exotic imaginary, one's ability to perform the banal, and subsequently to make sense of the world around one, is essential to the performance of the tourist. The everyday is necessarily present. After all, not only does one need to ingest food but there is also the (very necessary) elimination of the body's waste to be dealt with. However, in order to promulgate the myth(ologising) of tourism there is a (re)mediation through institutionalised media forms of everyday life as a rationalised, if not exotic, consumer activity. The banal and mundane practicalities of the individuals’ everyday life whilst elsewhere are commodified; eating becomes representations (and actualities) of the quality of service in the restaurant; sleeping becomes the image, if not always the reality, of the guaranteed good nights sleep. The banal activities of the individual at home are reconceptualised where one buys into a performance of the individual-as-consumer and all that goes with being part of a modern culture of consumption (Featherstone, 1995).

In preconfiguring everyday life through the imaginary, the tourist-in-becoming is placed at the centre of an unreflexive performance of the individual-as-consumer. This was clearly manifested in the tour brochure (see chapter four) which whilst clearly representing (and furthering the myth of) tourism as the exotic, had, at its core the mediation of an acceptable, indeed enticing reconfiguration and representation of the mundane and banal activities of daily life. Activities such as eating, sleeping and the comfortable movement of the individual through space become ways to entice; risk to
ontological security is repackaged as consumer opportunity. The dominant narratives mediated through, for example, the tour brochure re-present the tourist in a manner that minimizes any opportunity for negative outcomes, i.e. through perceptions of quality, management efficiencies and marketing. Rather than a social being, the individual is resituated first and foremost as the consumer/ing body where mindfulness is often regarded as one’s ability to make rational, commercial (purchasing) decisions.

In constructing the tourist imaginary as extra-ordinary, the individual performing as tourist is considered as out-of-place (to be a tourist is to necessarily be out-of-place). Somewhat ironically, the deliberate (pre)configuration of everyday life ensures the taken-for-grantedness of daily life on tour. After all, and as Cresswell (1996, pg. 10) comments, one’s "consciousness of place all but disappears when it appears to be working well". However for me, it was the mundane that pulled the individual in-to-place.

Thus, I wanted to work past the matter-of-factness (and taken-for-grantedness) that we append to daily life as a tourist and in turn question how particular individuals, such as tourists, "negotiate life worlds"(Conradson and Latham, 2005, pg. 228). In doing so I was able to attend to the everyday lifeworld of the tourist and thus begin to understand how sense was made of daily life on the road.

8.2.2 The FIGT: Social space everyday life and identity

Tourism is an overtly capitalist performance (although see socialist forms of tourism such as those practiced in France and many other places, e.g. Minnaert (2009)), which can certainly be regarded as a spectacle of consumption (Urry and Larsen, 2011). As such, so called 'mass' tourists, of which FIGT are a part (Obrador-Pons et al, 2009a), are often represented as depoliticised and frequently regarded as consumer dupes (Ritzer and Liska, 1997). This however, is to neglect inherent (but overlooked) tensions in the circuits of production, often resulting in the alienation of the individual. For example,
devaluing identity representations such as those of the tour group participant suggests that the FIGT tourist has less ‘character’ than when performing other forms of travel.

For me, this FIGT was the idea of collective space and practice. In achieving communal (political?) subjectivities through the construction and practice of communal space(s) - the coach was (re)constructed as a collective space, one that enabled and enhanced the performance of tourism. However, rather than this being achieved through supposed touristic performance, it was affected through the performance of everyday life. More than tourist performance as transforming identity, the performance of everyday life was a performative one – it did something; the banal acted to establish and maintain communitas (see chapter five).

In a micro-social sense, the coach was a ‘collectivity of space’ (Valentine, 2008). Rather than giving priority to the individual, together we socially constructed space, but our energies configured the coach as more than merely a mobile space. The coach as material culture contributed over and above its ability to move us from here to there; more even than a series of seats and windows through which to perform the tourist gaze. The coach became a place where we were able to “enter into the experiences and interest of unfamiliar lives...to develop a richer, more complex sense of [ourselves]” (Sennett, 2001, pg. 2). In exploring identity and everyday life I came, over time, to think of the coach as an “occasion for expressions of conviviality, indifference, animosity and familiarity” (Laurier and Philo, 2006, pg. 194).

8.3 Re-finding one-self

What I have wanted to do from the start of this thesis was to challenge the stability of self. To me it is not tourism per se that is full of wonder, rather it is the everyday life in which it is embedded. The ‘I’ rather than unchanging, is, as the borders in Figure 8.1 show, open to negotiation. The self is produced (and reproduced) through everyday
encounters with human and more-than-human actors. This is to argue the interactionist encounter (with other) as dynamic, one where an affective opening up of the body to a multitude of possibilities of the everyday life as a tourist disrupts the stability of the subject, ‘I’, the consumer. In thinking seriously about the mundane goings on in everyday life, the possibility of enchantment is made possible. This is achieved through more than the notion of reflexive self-development (Wearing and Wearing, 2001, Edensor, 2007). Rather it is made possible by an opening up of, and a re-sensitising to, the wonder of everyday life.

![Figure 8.1 Self – identity and everyday life](image)

To a greater or lesser extent, researching and writing from a reflexive ethnographic sensibility allowed me to problematise the often overlooked relationship between researcher and tourist (Enevoldsen, 2003), where I was at once researcher, tourist community member as well as complete member researcher (Adler and Adler, 1987). More than following the tourist, I became a touring subject. What I did, in effect, was to (re)situate the field where research encounters took place. I no longer want the daily life of the tourist to be considered backstage, relegated to this by the researcher (who is
more often than not unable to access such performances anyway), in search of the tourist performance of the exotic. In becoming and being the tourist I was able to foreground and bring to the light of day those mundane, banal and quotidian practices that allow the tourist to perform the exotic, and in turn to encounter difference.

A touring body is (differently) constituted through what on the surface appears as banal, unremarkable rhythms and routines of daily life. A routine (and an unreflexive) engagement of my body had initially given me the impression of a stable identity ('I'). However, it was in opening up to the micro-mobilities that I became attuned to the instability of the reflexive-self. Initial reflections on the volatile and erratic transitions of life on the coach resulted in resfeber (Lofgren, 2008a, 2008b) – the manifestation of a very real physical angst felt through and in my researcher/tourist body. Who was I and what was I came to dominate the internal dialogue.

Finding knowledge about (my) self, and importantly achieving this through engagement with the more-than-representation ‘project’ uncovered new and exciting ways that we might come to further understand not just the tourist but also other identity practices. Of course ethnographers have historically joined communities in order to understand others, and indeed increasingly in attempts to further knowledge of their own cultures. However to date, research on the individual-as-tourist has been dominated either by an economic research agenda; or limited by concerns of access (see Chapter Three). How for example, might one conduct emic research with those purportedly on holiday without running the risk of disruption? In adopting analytic-autoethnography (as a reflexive approach) I have shown that the researcher can more than gain access and achieve a being-with-the tourist, whereby that the accounts of the (reflexive) researcher themselves offer us new knowledge. In challenging the orthodoxy of current tourism research I have wanted to contribute to a wider methodological debate; one that seeks to disrupt, not just for the sake of disrupting, but in order to find new ways of knowledge construction (and indeed to ask what knowledge is). Although there remains
considerable opposition to engaging in auto-ethnographic methodologies within the wider field of tourism studies I have shown that not only can such reflexive methodologies be a valid means of enquiry, but they can also allow us exciting opportunities to engage in meaningful ways with mobile others.

8.4 Concluding remarks

Questioning the primacy of tourism as the ‘exotic’ has been a recurring theme throughout this thesis. Through foregrounding a previously unarticulated space in tourism studies, that of everyday life, I have challenged the idea of tourism and everyday life belonging to different ontological worlds (Larsen, 2008,). As such, throughout this thesis I have wanted to present an insider’s view of what it might mean to be a tourist. I wanted to illustrate how mobility is stabilised and managed through the maintenance of everyday life. In order to do so, I made use of reflexive methodologies.

My reasons for using this way of producing and (re)presenting knowledge was that it enabled me to explore the construction and mediation of tourism spaces and performances through everyday practices and thus to explore the ways in which being might be understood through the experiences of everyday life whilst elsewhere. After all, as Highmore (2008, pg. 395), rather evocatively suggests, “[s]ensual, bodily mundane life throws standard epistemologies into disarray”. In tourism, it is often everyday life that limits social and cultural transgression: can I get a decent coffee; are the toilets clean; what star rating is the hotel/hostel; do you accept American Express; where is the nearest Internet cafe? It is the commodification of everyday life that enables the movement of the construction and performance of the tourist. In developing an understanding of touristic experiences through the banal, so tourism and everyday life were revealed as having a dialectic relationship, in turn challenging the mythologizing of tourism as the exotic.
Rather than the FIGT as a space where one performs an unthinking identity, I would suggest such performances as emancipatory space(s). More precisely, it is the daily life of the tourist, stripped bare of its commodified, economic guise that presents such opportunities. Rather than the (this) tour group being representative of tourism as institution and thus as controlling, the community, as well as the individuals within, had agency. Being within a community (both of practice but importantly of affect) removed us from the constraints, if only temporarily, of contemporary neoliberal life. This is not to suggest that the commercial imperative disappears. After all, we had paid for an experience (we might, for example, have lodged complaints).

The community was a space in which one could (at least attempt to) resist the overtly commodified space(s) of tourism along with the attendant essentialised identity of the individual-as-tourist-as-consumer. In this thesis, a sense of ‘self’ came through proximal relations (Simpson, 2014), gained through shared performance of everyday life. For me, the mobile community was a space where "there persist[ed] an intense awareness of sociality and empathy that is at odds with the prevailing structures of power and authority" (Gardiner, 1996, pg.122).

Of course this is at odds with the capitalist agenda that institutionalises tourism as an industry. After all, it removes the veneer of the exotic resulting from the commodification of daily life. This self-aware individual thus becomes attuned to the imaginary – from the (possibilities of) symbolic violence represented within the tourist brochure to a personal critique of the luxury and comfort in which one is cosseted. This, however, creates (unbearable) tension and is at the centre of tourism and everyday life as dialectical.

Undertaking this thesis has made clear to me my need for multiple homes- my desires to belong in multiple in spaces and places. It has helped me work through my own performance(s) of home - why I do not fully unpack when I come or go. These insights
are essential to understanding my own identity. In travelling (and re-searching) in the FIGT I re-placed my own everyday life. I, like others, carried home with me and re-made it throughout the journey. Be it the technologies that allowed me to remain in contact with those I left behind and through which I re-engaged (virtually) with a different everyday life, to the suitcase. For me, as with others, packing, unpacking and repacking became symbolic of the ghosts of past homes, of travels and travails. New, physical traces of the tour – for example hotel room stickers and bag tags – engaged the affective capacities of my suitcase. They mobilise memories and immaterial traces of past performances. They, however, also take me into potential futures. There are the promises to keep in touch, the knowledge the suitcase will be brought out once again (if ever actually unpacked and put away). Photographs will be reviewed, both for pleasure and work and again bring memories to life. Stories will be told and retold (not always with the same endings), and it is the future lives that are affected that are now important. My, and others, everyday lives have been changed, and remain yet to be changed until next time.
References


ADEVY, P. 2006. If Mobility is Everything Then it is Nothing: Towards a Relational Politics of (Im)mobilities. Mobilities, 1, 75-94.


BAKHTIN, M. M. 1981. The dialogic imagination : four essays, Austin, University of Texas Press.
BERNSTEIN, R. J. 2010. The pragmatic turn. xi, 263 p.
Blackshaw, T. 2010. Key concepts in community studies, Los Angeles; London, SAGE.
Bochner, A. P. & Ellis, C. 2002. Ethnographically speaking: autoethnography, literature, and aesthetics, Walnut Creek, CA, AltaMira Press.


CALDER, M. 2003. *Encounters with the other: a journey to the limits of language through works by Rousseau, Defoe, Prevost and Graffigny*, Amsterdam, Editions Rodopi B.V.


CRESSWELL, T. n.d. Constellations of Mobility.


DICTIONARY, O. E. "banal, adj.", Oxford University Press.
DICTIONARY, O. E. "mundane, adj. and n.", Oxford University Press.

EDENDOR, T. 2010b. Geographies of rhythm: nature, place, mobilities and bodies, Farnham, Ashgate.


HALL, S. M. 2009. 'Private life' and 'work life': difficulties and dilemmas when making and maintaining friendships with ethnographic participants. *Area*, 41, 263-272.


HAYNER, N. S. 1923. The hotel: the sociology of hotel life. Thesis Ph D --University of Chicago Department of Sociology.


JAMESON, F. 1984. Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism. Studies, 29, 54.


MEADOWS, C. 2010. 'I'm in a Park and I'm Practically Dead': Insomnia, Arrhythmia and Withnail and I *In: EDENSOR, T. (ed.) Geographies of rhythm : nature, place, mobilities and bodies*. Farnham, : Ashgate.


MITCHELL, W. J. T. 1987. *Iconology : image, text, ideology*, Chicago University of Chicago,


Annals of Tourism Research, 39, 269-289.
ROCKMORE, T. 2006. Pragmatism as Epistemology, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.


SAUKKO, P. 2002. Studying the self: from the subjective and the social to personal and political dialogues. Qualitative Research, 2, 244-263.


SCOTT, D. G. 2006a. Socialising the stranger: hospitality as a relational reality Masters Masters, University of Otago.


SILK, M. Postcards From Pigtown. Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies, 10, 143-156.
New York: I.B. Tauris ;
In the United States distributed by Palgrave Macmillan.


SUOMINEN, A. 2003. WRITING WITH PHOTOGRAPHS, RE-CONSTRUCTING SELF: AN ARTS-BASED AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC INQUIRY. PhD PhD, Ohio State University.


TAYLOR, J. 2011. The intimate insider: negotiating the ethics of friendship when doing insider research. Qualitative Research, 11, 3-22.


TUCKER, H. 2007. Performing a Young People's Package Tour of New Zealand: Negotiating Appropriate Performances of Place. Tourism Geographies, 9, 139.


VENABLES, E. S. 2003. The Women from Rhodesia: An Auto-ethnographic Study of Immigrant Experience and [Re]Aggregation in Western Australia. PhD.


WESTWOOD, S. Out of the Comfort Zone: Situation, Participation and Narrative Interpretation in Tourism Research. The First International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, 2005 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.


WHYTE, W. F. 1943. Street corner society; the social structure of an Italian slum, Chicago, Ill., The University of Chicago Press.


WILLIS, P. E. 2000. The ethnographic imagination, Cambridge, UK
Malden, MA, Polity ;
Blackwell Publishers.


WRIGHT, R. 2011. From the Abbey to the Academy: The Heartful Autoethnography of a lost and Lonely-Looking Self Indulgent Sport Tourist PhD PhD, University of Otago.


Appendix One

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?
This research seeks to understand how tourists enact everyday practices whilst on holiday. In this case I hope through this research to develop insights into the role the hotel plays in allowing one to make sense of what might be considered normal domestic activities such as eating and drinking whilst in a foreign country. In effect, does the hotel become a de-facto home for one, or does one see it as part of the culture of the country being visited, and an essential component of the experience of being away from home, or on holiday?

What Type of Participants are being sought?
As a fellow passenger on this tour your input to this research is invaluable.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to take part in this project, you will not be asked to complete any questionnaires. What I would ask is that I might record any conversations we might have. If you are unwilling for any parts of our conversation to be recorded, then please feel free to let me know. I will also, naturally, be taking photographs as a fellow tourist. You will only be included in these photographs if I have your approval. If you wish, these photographs will be modified to ensure you maintain anonymity. I am happy to share these photos with you prior to the end of the tour.
This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind. Taking part in the project is supposed to be enjoyable. You will not be asked for any information that may identify you. The results of the project may be published and made available through the University of Otago library but every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity.

I will be more than happy to provide you with a copy of the completed research. The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned above will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

**Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?**
Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**What if Participants have any Questions?**
If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact me at:-
David Scott
Department of Tourism
University Telephone Number:- 006434798430
e-mail. d.scott@business.otago.ac.nz

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago, Department of Tourism Ethics Committee.
Problematising Identity practices; the role of social spatialisation

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. Any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed;

4. I understand that this project involves unstructured interviews which does not include formal questions but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Department of Tourism Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in conversation, the Committee has not been able to review the precise conversations that will develop.

In the event that the line of conversation does develop in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable it is my right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also I may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage of any kind.

5. I understand that photographs may be taken to assist in the interpretation of research data. I am aware that these photographs may only be taken after informed consent is provided. If these photographs are to be used then I am aware the images will be blurred to ensure my anonymity is maintained.
6. The results of the project may be published and available in the University of Otago library but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.

I agree to take part in this project.

(Signature of participant).........................................................

(Date)……………………

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago, Department of Tourism Ethics Committee