

TITLE:

**MANY HOMES FOR TOURISM: RE-CONSIDERING  
SPATIALIZATIONS OF HOME AND AWAY IN TOURISM  
MOBILITIES**

AUTHOR:

ALLISON HUI, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, LANCASTER UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT:

Tourism mobilities have long been spatialized as circular structures emanating from a primary home that is opposed to a space of ‘away’. Increasingly complex personal mobilities and experiences with multiple homes, however, challenge the assumptions on which this spatialization of tourism rests. This paper utilizes an analysis of travel memoir narratives of return home and second home mobilities to deconstruct the oppositions within traditional spatializations of tourism, revealing in the process the way in which the everyday and tourism are entangled and interactive. Memoir authors construct complex relationships between spaces and places, wherein second homes can inspire new tourism practices at both unfamiliar locations and primary homes, and returning to previous homes can involve tourism of and at home. A consideration of these relationships reveals the difficulty of labeling mobilities as essentially touristic and suggests possibilities for new spatializations, ontology and methodologies that leave room for many homes for tourism.

KEY WORDS:

tourism; mobilities; home; space; place; spatialization; second homes

This is the accepted version of this paper. **The final, definitive version of this paper has been published as** Hui, A (2008). Many homes for tourism: re-considering spatializations of home and away in tourism mobilities. *Tourist Studies*, 8(3), 291-311 **by SAGE Publications Ltd, All rights reserved.** <http://tou.sagepub.com/content/8/3/291>

Though mobilities of people, goods, and ideas have undergone significant changes in recent decades, the concepts used to explain them have not always followed suit. Global mobilities of people, including migrations and leisure travel, have been recognized as increasingly important to the ways we conceptualize tourism (Coles and Timothy, 2004; Hall, 2005a; Hall and Williams, 2002; Minca and Oakes, 2006), however as of yet few scholars have taken up the challenge of incorporating insights from complex mobilities into traditional framings of tourism. Rather than allowing these mobilities to inform treatments of tourism, too many studies have implicitly supported the idea that tourism involves circular travel patterns emanating from a stationary geographic home. Taking migrations and other complex mobilities into account, this formulation of tourism which demarcates a home space that stands in opposition to a tourism space is insufficient and fraught with difficulties.

As this paper illustrates, tourism has been spatialized in ways that constrain our understanding of diverse tourism experiences. A model of singular homes and circular tourism mobilities is no longer representative of many individuals' experiences, yet numerous studies of tourism still remain limited by spatializations that mark out acceptable spaces for tourism and exclude homes. Focusing on insights from narratives of return and second home mobilities, this paper illustrates the limitations of current spatializations of tourism and suggests possibilities for reworking the ontological and methodological groundings of studies of tourism.

### **Leaving ‘home’: Circular journeys and the difficulty of acceptable spaces**

The inability of current conceptualizations of tourism to adequately address issues of complex mobilities centers on the limitations of current spatializations of tourism. Shields’ concept of social spatialization addresses the process by which space is socially constructed through the discursive and non-discursive practices of individuals (1991: 7). Individuals interact with space and by so doing create a matrix of spatial meanings and values that are socially shared. This matrix of social meanings creates a system of differences that becomes entrenched in political and cultural ideologies. Spatial markers act as metaphors for cultural values, and create ‘imagined geographies’ upon which attributes such as good and bad, or female and male, are written. When these contrasts are ‘institutionalised or rendered as a natural division’ (Shields, 1991: 261), they gain a persuasive influence upon further actions and help to facilitate practices that further entrench differences.

Though Shields’ *Places on the Margin* considers the spatializations of concrete locations such as Brighton and Niagara Falls, we can also take the concept of spatialization further to consider how concepts themselves can be spatialized. Tourism, as a concept, has been based on the spatialization of two contrasting nodes – home and away – between which there is a circular journey from home to away and back again. In one of the first major works on tourism, MacCannell argues that ‘tours are circular structures, and the last destination is the same as the point of origin: home’ (1976: 168). Many years later, Urry provides a very different analysis of tourism, but also names it as travel to, and a temporary stay within, sites that are ‘outside the normal places of residence and work’ (1990: 3). For Urry, a ‘clear intention to return “home” within a relatively short period of

time' is a key characteristic of tourism (1990: 3). Cohen also includes movement criteria in his definition of the tourist role, suggesting that tourists are unique travellers because their trips are temporary, voluntary, round-trip, long, non-recurrent, and for non-instrumental ends (1974).

The opposition of home and away, as well as the circular journey connecting them, also become clear in many technical definitions that operationalize tourism based on space and time criteria. The Statistics Canada Canadian Travel Survey, for example, defines a tourist trip as being 'at least 80 km one-way from home', and not lasting longer than one year (Statistics Canada, in Svenson, 2004). The World Tourism Organization also rests its work on such quantifiable movements, and in one document argues that 'the concept of usual environment is undoubtedly the basic foundation that supports the conceptual structure of tourism as a scope of analysis in itself' (2005: 49). In both these cases, tourism only becomes conceptually possible when the node of home is established as a contrast to the areas outside home where tourism takes place. Defining and operationalizing tourism thus become exercises in mapping acceptable spaces for tourism. With home as the starting point, a decision line is drawn at a prescribed radius, and all spaces within the mapped circle become unfit spaces for tourism. Only those spaces beyond the circle have the ability to be named tourist spaces. Tourism mobilities are as a result only those that extend beyond what is considered the usual home environment and enter the realm of 'away'.

Support for this characterization of home-based and circular tourist mobilities come from a variety of sources. Historically, the rise in leisure travel during the 19<sup>th</sup> century marked a significant shift wherein individuals who may have never before left

their immediate communities began to travel greater and greater distances for pleasure, thanks to the increasing availability of leisure time, rail travel and timetables, package tours, and guidebooks. For these individuals, spaces of away were undoubtedly a striking contrast to home, significantly more so than in today's world where flows of people and media are regular occurrences.

Ontological support for this spatialization comes from its resonance with some theories of home. Home has often carried a strong connotation as the foundational site of Western identities. Not only do homes or usual residences act as predominant sites in which individuals interact, but they also come to be seen as intimately connected to individual identities. As a result, the separation between home and away in tourism can be justified based on the differing evaluations of these spaces' roles in identity formation. Such an ontology often becomes reflected in research despite acknowledgements of the multiple spatial, relational, and political facets of home (De Souza, 2005: 137).

Functionalist theories also support this home-based circular characterization of tourism. Tourism is seen to be separate from everyday life, and therefore productive because of this separation. As Cohen notes, 'tourism only remains functional, so long as it does not become central to the individual's life-plan and aspirations – since only so long will it regulate his tensions and dissatisfactions, refreshing and restoring him, without destroying his motivation to perform the tasks of his everyday life' (1979: 181). As a result, an individual claiming a more central role for tourism in his or her life would be marked as 'deviant', as someone shirking his or her responsibilities to society (Cohen, 1979: 181). A circular understanding of tourist trips and the division between home and

away is thus needed in functionalist theories in order to mark off tourism as appropriately peripheral to everyday life.

Though not all studies claim such justifications, have explicit technical definitions, or clearly outline the opposition of home and away or the importance of a circular journey, the basic spatialization wherein tourists leave home for a circular journey still remains an unaddressed conceptual foundation for much work on tourism. This is an ongoing challenge because the apparently natural division that this spatialization renders between home and away, as well as the imagined geography that circular journeys provide, limits the insights we can gain from studying tourism.

For one, the opposition of home and away suggests their separation and isolation. Not only are these two types of spaces assumed to be different, but so too are the activities undertaken in them: one type of activity is seen to occur at home, and a different type in other spaces. Whereas the assumption that significant interaction occurs between spaces of home and away would demand considering both in any study, the opposition of these spaces allows for the consideration of only one space independently of the other.

Such an approach is prevalent in many studies of tourism, and cases centered on one destination have yielded insights about everything from the multiple types of authenticity (Bruner, 1994) to the relationship between myths, spaces, and maps (DeLyser, 2003), the power struggles between locals and tourists (Mordue, 2005), the embodied practices at the Taj Mahal (Edensor, 1998), and the spatialization of ‘deserted isles’ (Davis, 2005) or icons of ‘maritimicity’ (McKay, 1988). Though these contributions add significantly to our understandings of tourism, their spatial focus

reinforces the legitimacy of considering tourism spaces of ‘away’ independently of spaces of home, or any other spaces, and thus reinforces a dichotomized spatialization.

Other studies have focused not on particular destinations, but rather historical or conceptual concerns that leave spatializations largely unquestioned: Adler charts the changing role of the senses in tourism from the 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries (1989), Löfgren enunciates different generations of tourists and changing tastes in destinations (1994), Greenblatt and Gagnon suggest tourists are temporary strangers (1983), and Ritzer and Liska argue that tourism has undergone a ‘McDisneyization’ (1997). Though such work outlines the way in which tourists look for different things in the spaces they visit, it does little to question the relationship between the many spaces travellers visit. Ritzer and Liska come the closest to challenging traditional spatializations of tourism by suggesting ‘that people increasingly travel to other locales in order to experience much of what they experience in their day-to-day lives’ (1997: 99). Nevertheless, the similarities they identify between home and away primarily serve as an argument against the increased differentiation of tourism rather than for a renewed consideration of the spatialization of home and away.

In addition to legitimating the isolation of spaces of home and away, traditional spatializations of tourism also suggest that only two spaces are of interest – a singular home and a contrasting space that is ‘away’. Though this formulation can well represent the educational gains of Grand Tour trips (Van den Abbeele, 1992) and highlight important factors of many vacation mobilities, it fails to leave room for many of the diverse mobilities practiced today. National and international migrations, for example, challenge this spatialization of tourism by multiplying the number of spaces that can be

called 'homes' or 'usual residences'. By so doing, these migrations bring into question the naming of only one location as the 'home' to which tourism mobilities relate.

Even in non-migrant populations, the spatial mobilities of everyday life can have many complexities not well addressed by circular representations of tourism. Mobilities that mix leisure and business, for example, now often fit definitions of tourism while also being routine parts of life that can happen monthly or even daily (Hall, 2005b: 95). In addition, experiences of culture, community, home, and identity are increasingly mobile and complex, and 'this makes increasingly problematic our assumptions of singular place identities and geographic rootedness as starting points from which to build social theories to explain tourism, leisure, and identity' (Williams, 2002: 356). Premising touristic activities upon the recognition of one home is thus a simplification that erases the operation of complex mobilities and multiplicities of home.<sup>1</sup>

Many scholars have articulated the need for a re-consideration of the geographies and spatializations of tourism. Spatial and cultural concerns have led Iain Chambers to suggest that tourism must be understood not as bounded travel that is linked to a static geographic home, but rather through the framework of a fluid migrancy (1994). Similarly, C. Michael Hall has called for a revision of definitions that will allow tourism, leisure and other worldly movements to be examined simultaneously (2005a). Other scholars have noted that though addressing mobilities has often been left to specialized areas of study such as tourism and migration, it needs to be acknowledged as a key facet of social life more generally (Hastrup and Olwig, 1997: 6; Williams and Kaltenborn, 1999). As Cohen recognizes, 'instead of a clearly bounded phenomenon, tourism upon closer inspection turns out to be vaguely delimited and to merge imperceptibly with other



types of traveller rôles' (1974: 527-8). It is therefore crucial, he suggests, that we allow the study of tourism to merge with the study of travellers (Cohen, 1974: 528). Despite the many years that have passed since this assertion, little has been done to facilitate this connection. As a result, Coles et al. have recently echoed Cohen's point by arguing that an awareness of global movements and mobilities has not been adequately incorporated into tourism studies as characteristics of not only tourists, but individuals (2005). Tourists have been acknowledged as undertaking tourist mobilities, but this alone is insufficient because we must also understand how tourists are individuals who are more widely mobile.

Spatializations of tourism and understandings of individuals' mobilities are significantly linked in that the scope of individuals' mobilities affect their understandings of the spaces they visit. The opposition and differentiation of home and away makes a more convincing argument in the context of the 19<sup>th</sup> century than in an era of global media conglomerates and possible McDonaldization. The increased physical, virtual and imaginative travel of individuals has changed how spaces of home and away are encountered; mobilities reshape spatializations. In order to consider alternate spatializations of tourism then, we turn in the next sections to a consideration of complex 21<sup>st</sup> century mobilities.

### **Return home mobilities and second home mobilities**

The remainder of this paper is drawn from a study examining two unique cases of tourism that are centrally concerned with mobility and multiple homes. Return home mobilities, that is, mobilities involving a visit to a previous area of residence, and second

home mobilities, such as trips to vacation homes, are unlike more traditional cases of tourism because of their interactions with home and recurrent trips. It is these characteristics, however, that were deemed important when choosing these cases, because they facilitate an understanding of tourism as involving interactions with change and novelty that can be located in close contact with the everyday (Franklin, 2003).

One of the reasons that little progress has been made towards integrating sociologies of travel and tourism is that, as Cohen points out, most studies have remained focused upon the fully-fledged tourist, while ignoring people occupying marginal tourist roles, such as business travellers, pilgrims, and old-country visitors (1974). As a result, issues of migrancy and more complex mobilities have been overlooked in studies and spatializations of tourism, and valuable insights from work on migration and transnationalism remain disconnected from studies of tourism. Studying marginal cases that incorporate complex mobilities and multiple homes leaves space to consider the interaction of tourism and migration within global mobilities, and to contribute to new spatializations of tourism that address the complexities of twenty-first century touristic practices, spaces, and places.

A consideration of these marginal tourism cases was undertaken through the study of travel memoirs dating from the late twentieth century. The literary journeys constructed by various authors provide a unique entry point into considerations of the relationships between tourism and home. Though these texts, like other travel writing, are marked by a mixture of facts and myths that are combined into carefully edited personal accounts, the comprehensiveness or accuracy of the episodes in the narrative were not of primary concern. Rather, this study was concerned with analyzing the relationships

between spaces and places that are constructed within these texts, and while authorial choices may have eliminated the discussion of particular spaces, or relationships, this does not eliminate the value of those that remain. Following critical discourse analysis, the memoirs were regarded as forms of practice themselves, and ones that actively construct particular relationships and values. This study used critical discourse analysis as a tool to explore the differences in how relationships between spaces, place, and practices of tourism are represented in tourism memoirs and in academic studies of tourism.

Whereas the methodological necessity of setting technical and/or conceptual boundaries for academic studies of tourism can lead to the reproduction of results that conform to prior ontological assumptions about tourism, travel memoirs are guided by different constraints and boundaries. Though certainly concerns for things such as narrative cohesion can limit travel memoirs in certain ways, authors need not define what tourism is before discussing it, or even adhere to a consistent definition. As a result, the two genres of writing provide different openings for framing and discussing tourism mobilities.

One could point out that the travel writing genre itself conforms to circular representations of tourism, with a heavy emphasis being placed on destinations and exceptional experiences away from home. Holland and Huggan note that “‘Home,’ after all, is the frame of reference for most contemporary travel writers (even when it is precisely the category of “home” that their writing calls in question). Their experiences of travel are predicated on the possibility of return; their adventure trips are round trips’ (1998: 5). Though certainly travel writing plays into the same spatializations of tourism as many academic studies, it can also call these into question precisely because such

categories support the writing but remain less important than the literary journey being presented. Similarly, the fact that many memoir authors in this study do not identify themselves as tourists, and in some cases make an effort to separate themselves from tourists, does not hinder analysis. It is not the roles authors identify with that are at issue here, but rather the connections they construct between the many spaces and places they encounter. Whether claiming to be tourists or not, authors construct relationships between the spaces and places of their mobilities, and these relationships are instructive for considering what traditional conceptualizations of tourism have left out.

The sampling of travel memoirs was theoretically driven, and works were chosen which facilitated an understanding of the case by speaking to the mobilities and experiences surrounding non-primary homes. There were five substantial memoirs included in this study (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977; Chiang, 1977; Gable and Gable, 2005; MacGregor, 2002; Phillips, 1990), along with several other supportive texts (Bainbridge, 2002; Gordon, 1989, 2006; Liu, 2005; MacGregor, 2005). These texts represent diverse geographies of mobility, as well as diverse experiences with home.

Analysis proceeded with a careful distinction between space and place. Space is understood to consist of static material geographic locations, and is related to place, which is an immaterial entity arising from the placing, ordering, and representing of material objects (Hetherington, 1997). Separating place from space in this way emphasizes the interactive and embodied process involved in the creation of places. Though human geographers have tended to describe place in terms of subjective assessments of space, that is, in terms of individual attachment that arises from giving space meaning (Williams and Patterson in Kaltenborn, 1997: 176), Hetherington notes

that this definition fails to incorporate an understanding of the material objects involved (1997). Considering place then as something constituted in the placing, ordering, and representing of material objects emphasizes the interactive and embodied process of creating. As Hetherington notes, subjective assessments and affective reactions are still acknowledged, but are seen to come from, and feed back into, the process of placing and ordering. As a result, place is created as an immaterial entity, consisting of representations and memories that can be mobile and experienced in many spaces. Places are thus virtual, in Shields' sense of being 'real idealizations' that are immaterial, but not abstract, and which can be actualized into concrete forms through activities such as drawing pictures (2003).

The return home and second home memoirs of this study shed considerable light on the relationships between spaces and places in tourism. These literary mobilities to and through homes demonstrate that places, spaces, and practices of tourism do not always fit dichotomous spatializations or circular geographies. The following sections outline several excerpts of memoir authors' literary journeys that suggest instead new spatializations of travel. Rather than isolating spaces, authors enact their connection – suggesting the way in which second homes can be connected to tourism sites and can infuse everyday life with touristic interactions, while previous homes can be sites of tourism and can be visited through family mobilities that join, rather than separate, tourism and the everyday.

### **Moving through Palladian places**

With the image of traditional spatializations of tourism in the background then, we turn now to consider other possible relationships between the spaces and places of tourism. The first literary journey comes from Gable and Gable's second home memoir *Palladian Days* (2005). Thanks to significant financial and temporal resources, the Gables are able to travel between their primary home in the United States, a second home in Italy, and a variety of other destinations in Italy. Whereas a traditional spatialization of tourism would suggest only the difference between their US home and the Italian villas and cities they visit, the Gables clearly construct connections between the place of their second home and the many other locations in Italy that they visit. Indeed, the history of their second home leads them to seek out other spaces touched by the family that lived there and the architect that built it. Tourism thus appears as an offshoot of their second home mobility, and the spaces of tourism are not separated from, but rather closely intertwined with, their second home.

The distance between the Gables' primary home in Atlanta and the Villa Cornaro in Italy, which they acquire as a second home, is substantial in geographic, cultural, and historical terms. Built by the famous architect Palladio, the Villa Cornaro proves not only a suitable second home, but also an interesting historical site, a challenging building to renovate, and a unique cultural gathering point. The Gables' text reveals this villa to be ordered not only as a second home place, but also as a Palladian one that is connected to the famous architect who designed it. Their interaction with this Palladian place is

connected to their experiences in many other spaces, and it leads them to undertake unique touristic mobilities near their second home.

The Gables' construction of the Villa Cornaro as a Palladian place receives considerable emphasis in their memoir. Throughout the text, Sally makes references to Palladio, thereby demonstrating her comment that 'Andrea Palladio is a constant presence in my thoughts when I am at Villa Cornaro' (Gable and Gable, 2005: 175).<sup>2</sup> She imagines details of the first meeting between Palladio and Giorgio Cornaro at the future site of the Villa Cornaro (Gable and Gable, 2005: 74-6), and wonders about how Palladio would react to her decorating: 'I wonder how he would like the flowers I've just placed on the dining-room table. Would he approve of the furnishings we have? I know he'd like our kitchen!' (Gable and Gable, 2005: 175-6). In this way, Palladio appears as an intangible presence in the Gables' experiences of the space of their Villa. This presence is affective, and the Gables' beliefs about Palladio's reactions and opinions impact how they materially interact with the space during several waves of renovations. After completing complex and costly renovations on the upstairs south portico, they are comforted because the project met their 'ultimate test': 'Palladio would be pleased' (Gable and Gable, 2005: 242). Palladio has an important connection to the space, and through their practices they construct and order the Villa Cornaro as not only a second home place, but also a Palladian place that is marked by representations and memories connected to Palladio and his designed spaces.

This attachment to the Palladian place of their second home affects the Gables' mobilities. Their desire for further information about the historical and architectural context of their second home space leads them to instigate a touristic trip during which

they can gaze upon and interact materially with other Palladian spaces. Sometime after acquiring the Villa Cornaro as a second home, the Gables set off in a rental car on a sightseeing trip to visit and visually compare their villa to others Palladio designed. As Sally notes:

We are trying to arrive at our own conception of where Villa Cornaro sits in this pantheon of Palladian icons. About eighteen Palladio-designed villas still stand in the Veneto. . . We decide that Barbaro, Emo, La Malcontenta, and La Rotonda, together with Cornaro, constitute a sort of ‘Big Five.’ They are all large villas designed (except La Rotonda) for wealthy Venetian patrons; they were built substantially the way Palladio designed them; and they have not suffered fundamental changes since. So these are the ones we set off to see first. We are on the lookout for the contrasts and similarities to our own villa. (Gable and Gable, 2005: 83)

The trip is interesting because it is centrally related to, and inspired by, the Gables’ second home. Had they not already established and experienced their second home as a Palladian place, it is less likely they would have undertaken this mobility to interact with other Palladian places. The practices that arrange the place of a ‘Palladian villa’ in their second home therefore become important to understanding their touristic practices of gazing and touring at the other villas.

In a similar manner, the Gables’ acquisition of the Villa Cornaro leads them to feel connected to the Cornaro family, for whom the villa was originally built, and this connection also affects their touristic mobilities. While reading an article in Atlanta, Sally notices the name of Christoph Cornaro, who is Austria’s ambassador to the Vatican (see



Gable and Gable, 2005: 153-160). Curious about the potential connection to the Cornaro family of their villa, Carl writes a letter to the ambassador. It turns out the ambassador is indeed a relative of their Cornaros and the Gables offer to host Christoph and his wife Gail at the Villa Cornaro. After accepting this invitation, the Cornaros reciprocate, and Sally and Carl embark upon a trip to the Cornaros' home in Rome.

The Gables' trip to Rome comes as a result of their connection to a former space of the Cornaro family, and becomes filled with visits to other sites that are connected to the family. The highlight of the tour of Rome is a trip to the Cornaro Chapel, within the church of Santa Maria della Vittoria. The church is closed for restoration, but Christoph arranges a private tour, during which they are able to converse with the chief restorer and even touch some of the original artifacts. Within their memoir, this visit to Rome is narrated in considerable detail, and holds a place of notable importance. Their visit, however, would not likely have happened had it not been for Christoph, whom they met by virtue of their connection to and interest in the Villa Cornaro, their second home.

These touristic mobilities to Palladian villas and sites in Rome with connections to the Cornaro family are made meaningful because of the interaction between these spaces of 'away' and the Gables' unique second home. Rather than second home and away being opposites, they are of a similar kind, and indeed the Gables' second home sparks interest in these new yet similar spaces. As a result, the Gables' tourism to Palladian villas and Rome is not well understood in comparison to their primary home. Nor does this tourism fit a circular representation, as their departure from Atlanta and their touristic visits are separated by periods of habitation at their second home. Traditional spatializations of tourism are clearly not adequate for characterizing these

mobilities, as fitting this narrative into a circular representation is difficult, and doing so would significantly alter the relationships that the Gables outline between various spaces and places.

### **Changing experiences at and of home**

Though not all second homes are as unique as the Villa Cornaro, with its interesting historical links to architects and prominent families, all second homes are by definition connected to at least one other home. In addition to affecting touristic practices and mobilities, connections to second homes can have a significant affect upon experiences at primary homes.<sup>3</sup> Though traditional spatializations of tourism imply that the everyday is limited to home spaces, while the extraordinary and touristic occur away from home, the Gables show that practices of everyday and tourism overlap in many spaces.

Leaving primary residences and establishing connections to other spaces and places can lead individuals to undertake unique activities upon their return. That is, just as the connections to a place or space can contribute to decisions to undertake touristic mobilities, so also can they inspire touristic activities of the everyday within familiar spaces. One example of such a situation would be when individuals discover a love for new types of food or alcohol while visiting foreign countries and then search these out in unfamiliar neighborhoods or restaurants upon returning to their primary residence. In this way, tourism can affect changes within familiar spaces of home.

The Gables' experiences in their second home inspire unique touristic practices, a type of tourism of the everyday, when they travel to Atlanta. Within the Gables'

repetitive mobilities between the Villa Cornaro in Italy and their primary home in Atlanta, experiences and tasks overlap. Thus, practices oriented to projects or goals at their second home are often undertaken in the spaces in and around their primary home. After their first visit to, and departure from, the villa, Sally discusses plans for their winter in Atlanta:

We just carry [back to Atlanta] surreal memories and a determination to spend the winter learning more about the mansion/barn that has joined our lives like a moose at a picnic. I realize that I've associated myself with a long chain of history, but it is a history I don't know, about people I never heard of, events I've never read about, and influences on the modern world that I never knew existed.

(Gable and Gable, 2005: 31)

Sally notes a perceptible gap in knowledge about their new space, and since this gap is not desirable, they set out to find resources that will help to fill it. This practice of acquiring knowledge is very deliberate: 'The villa is a great cache of secrets, and I intend to pry out each one' (Gable and Gable, 2005: 33). While in Atlanta and away from her second home, Sally proceeds to do research – a practice connected to her second home that ostensibly would not be undertaken in her primary home were it not for the presence of this other space.

When it comes time to renovate the kitchen at the Villa Cornaro, Sally again undertakes reading and research in Atlanta. Indeed, after noting that they always knew a kitchen renovation would be required, she asserts: 'During the winter in Atlanta I begin by roving the aisles of Barnes & Noble' (Gable and Gable, 2005: 53). The missing noun in this sentence, the 'what' of her beginning, can be read as 'the renovation' of her

second home kitchen. Again, Atlanta becomes the site for practices that are undertaken as a result of the existence of, and past and future interactions with, a second home.

The examples of these interconnected practices abound. While first furnishing the villa, Sally's quest for appropriate Chinese deco rugs begins in Italy, but is continued in Atlanta when she discovers very high prices at Italian stores (Gable and Gable, 2005: 134). She ends up buying 'five or six over a period of three years' and then transporting them to Italy by air freight (Gable and Gable, 2005: 134). As well, after discovering a considerable genealogical volume on the Cornaro family, the Gables decide to organize its information, and Carl begins inputting information into a genealogical program on his computer in Atlanta (Gable and Gable, 2005: 92). This activity takes up a substantial amount of his time, and is again an activity that would be unlikely to occur were it not for their connection to a particularly unique second home.

These practices are significant not only because they highlight how a context of multiple spaces adds depth to understandings of particular practices, but also because they suggest how connections to one space can encourage practices that are exceptional or unusual in another space. Though some of these practices may resemble everyday practices, depending on the Gable's normal activities in Atlanta, they also retain the unique quality of being oriented towards an absent place and space. Thus, while visiting the library or Barnes & Noble might be an everyday activity, looking for books in the history, architecture, or renovation section could be quite unusual, and furthermore is infused with a sense of change because of the transit and mobility from the second home space that instigated the search for books. In this way, practices such as researching,

shopping, and cataloguing become infused with touristic novelty or change, despite their occurrence within everyday spaces.

Tourism here appears as a spatially dispersed phenomenon, in that it not only occurs in spaces all over the globe, but also interpolates these spaces into itself. Practices of tourism then are not isolatable in singular locations. Climbing the stairs of the Eiffel Tower would not be possible without prior research into reaching Paris, and the journey itself. Neither is it isolated from a subsequent trip to climb the steepest section of the Great Wall of China, as the successful completion of the stairs in Paris makes the Great Wall seem easily attainable. To lose a sense of the connection between these spaces, or the many virtual places they are connected to, is to lose a significant portion of the richness of touristic experiences.

Just as connections between many spaces and places can influence touristic practices and mobilities, so too can touristic practices and mobilities instigate new activities within areas of usual residence. Indeed, the activities themselves can extend over multiple spaces. The existence of multiple homes can lead to unique situations where homes become sites for tourism.

### **Touring others' lives**

Homes can also become sites for tourism in the case of return trips to previous homes. Such trips can push the confusion of everyday and tourism even further, because in returning to a previous home one can confront spaces and routines that were once part of everyday life, but have since been eclipsed by new spaces and routines. In addition, return trips to previous homes can quite literally involve touring homes – staying with

friends and relatives and becoming involved in the rhythm of their everyday lives. The everyday and tourism become intermixed and returning to familiar spaces after a period elsewhere can demonstrate how current and previous homes are not separate and opposed but rather articulated off each other.

Blaise and Mukherjee's mobility to India in their memoir *Days and Nights in Calcutta* (1977) illustrates touristic engagements with change that are both facilitated and constrained by their physical presence in others' homes. Both professors at Canadian universities, Clark Blaise and Bharati Mukherjee return from work one day to find their home, and nearly all of their possessions, have been destroyed in an accidental fire. Shortly thereafter, Bharati is involved in a serious car accident, and this additional trauma prompts them to take their children and leave the country to spend a year in India visiting Bharati's family and former homes. The story of this year away from their primary home is presented twice – first from Clark's point of view and then from Bharati's.

Though Bharati is intimately familiar with many of the locations they visit, Clark has only been in India a few times, and remains in many ways an outsider. As a result, Clark's narrative speaks to his experience as a white male who has been adopted into Bharati's Indian family. His passages are often richly descriptive and indicative of an iconic touristic experience – outlining the details of locations they visit or his discomfort when encountering complex familial prescriptions or unwanted attention from locals. Clark's musings about Indian culture, and the lack of conflict he observes between mysticism and rationalism, further demonstrate how his experience in India is marked by comparisons between what he knows of Canadian life and culture and the culture and expectations he finds in India. This enunciation of gaze and comparisons to a distant

primary home are consistent with many existing understandings of the tourist role, and help to construct Clark's role as a semi-detached outsider within India.

Clark's narrative contrasts starkly with Bharati's very personal account of the negotiation involved in her return home. Returning home is a strange experience for Bharati because of her dual status as a native and a visitor. The spaces she visits are both previous homes and spaces for vacation, and this contradiction leads Bharati to attach herself to old and new friends, becoming 'absorbed into the daily texture of other people's lives' (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 199). Over time, this practice makes Bharati aware of the differences between her life in Montreal and the lives of her friends (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 203). Being like a tourist and examining the banalities of others' lives brings Bharati reevaluate her life in Canada:

Over the months as I tagged along with them [her friends] and followed the daily structure of their lives, I felt an accumulating embarrassment about the self-absorption of my own life in Montreal. I worked with no charities, had no connection with neighbors, or with ethnic and professional groups. Depression and joy were limited to promotion and tenure, acceptance or rejection of manuscripts. (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 203)

Touring the lives of her friends thus leads her to compare her primary home to India, and this comparison, which is a reversal of the type Clark demonstrates, brings a new perspective to her own life.

Both Clark and Bharati actively engage with change during their time in India, but this change is enunciated in comparison to different spaces and places. In this way, their

experiences of tourism are qualitatively different, even when they undertake similar practices.

In addition to Bharati's touring of her friends' lives, she and Clark both spend substantial time engaged in her parents' home and lives. For a portion of their trip, Bharati, Clark, and their two children live with her parents in a suburb outside of Bombay. During this time, they learn about and practice the particularities of Bharati's parents' routines. For Clark, even activities such as shopping hold substantial appeal (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 21). Though this time spent engaging with the change of their relatives' lives reveals interesting revelations, it also holds significant challenges. Bharati's father often acts as an obstacle to their mobility, and despite Bharati's protests, he uses the price of gasoline and the danger of violence as reasons to prevent trips outside the house (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 283). Thus, familial roles and obligations become constraints upon Bharati and Clark's leisure and mobility, confining them to a home that is not theirs.

After awhile, Clark notes that the repetition of this daily life became tedious: 'It wears you down, daily life that has a ritual sameness, when the ritual isn't yours' (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 39). As a result, they decide to take a vacation from their vacation, visiting luxurious tourist accommodations including the Sheraton-Oberoi in Nariman Point and the Taj Mahal in Bombay (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 42). When they finally leave Bombay for good, it is a welcomed change (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 52), due to their desire for more control over their own mobility.

The existence of India as Mukherjee's previous home is thus linked to a set of obligations that extend over her social networks there. These obligations both facilitate



interesting touristic engagements with the homes and lives of friends and families, and constrain their freedom to undertake other practices. Thus, though mobilities to previous homes have much touristic potential, they also, like those to many other spaces, hold significant obstacles to the free pursuit of touristic or everyday practices.

### **Labeling mobilities**

As these literary journeys have suggested, many more connections can exist between the spaces of tourism mobilities than are recognized in traditional spatializations. Rather than being oppositional forces, home and away can be marked by similarity or difficult struggles because homes can also be found ‘away’. Non-home spaces can also hold significant importance. The mobilities between many different spaces can be used to actively engage with the creation and re-creation of relationships to and between place and space. The place of a Palladian villa, for one, becomes connected through mobilities of ideas and people to the spaces of Villa Barbaro, Villa Emo, and the Cornaro Chapel. Movements between multiple homes likewise intertwine these spaces and places – leading to entanglements of tourism and the everyday.

In light of these negotiations, which challenge the basis of traditional spatializations of tourism, it becomes difficult to assess the relationship between tourism and mobilities. In the case of Blaise and Mukherjee, undertaking a trip as a family leads to a complex mix between visiting relatives, visiting tourist attractions, and even taking a vacation to a tourist resort in order to get away from relatives (1977: 42). Though for Mukherjee their trip is a return home, Blaise has a familiarity with neither the spaces nor the customs and culture. Furthermore, they visit India in search not only of interactions

with family and relaxation at luxury resorts, but also opportunities for productive work – as indicated by Clark’s interaction with intellectuals and his desire to become familiar with India in order to set a novel there (Blaise and Mukherjee, 1977: 85-92, 137). These diverse components illustrate the complex matrix of home and tourist spaces, places, and practices that are intertwined within their mobility, which make assessments of its touristic quality difficult.

Other texts of this study similarly show that return home and second home mobilities are not homogenous phenomena. Many incorporate both practices and trips connected to familiarity and family as well as those that are more explicitly for leisure or tourism. Chiang, Bainbridge, and Liu all address mobilities that cover a multitude of home and not-home places (Bainbridge, 2002; Chiang, 1977; Liu, 2005: 167-8). Other authors, like Blaise and Mukherjee, note the need to go on vacations from their vacations: MacGregor travels up the Crow River to get a break from his cottage (2002), Bainbridge takes a trip to break up a period of family gatherings (2002: 183), the Gables take trips to Venice from their nearby second home (2005), and Chiang has periods of leisure travel placed throughout his trip home to China (1977). Their mobilities thus incorporate diverse spaces, motivations and interactions.

Just as touristic novelty can be found within familiar spaces, so also is familiarity a part of exotic tourist locals. Many individuals undertake repetitive journeys to tropical resorts or favourite cities, and these mobilities can involve the development of routines, such as always eating at the same restaurants. Similarly, tourist practices can be repeated over the course of mobilities, such as when individuals walk through gardens in every city they visit. In some cases, routinization can lead to the creation of ‘touristscapes’

wherein visitors enact a mundane tourist habitus (Edensor, 2007). Traditional tourist vacations and mobilities to familiar locations are thus marked by interactions with both familiarity and change.

In light of this heterogeneity, there is a danger in considering physical mobilities to be, in essence, touristic. Such a label can mask the combination of familiarity and change, touristic practices and non-touristic ones, which characterize mobilities. Much of the existing tourist literature, by considering the connection between tourist practices and tourist spaces, has fallen to describing tourists and tourist practices by virtue of identifying tourist movement and voyages. In order to remain open to seeing the possibilities for familiarity and exceptionality, the everyday and the touristic in all mobilities, any assessments of the touristic orientation of mobilities are best made alongside qualifications of the heterogeneity inherent within them.

Detaching the touristic label from bounded segments of physical mobility or movement is a key step then towards detaching tourism from limited spatializations. While it may still be valuable to characterize the motivations behind certain mobilities as touristic, any generic labeling of segments of mobility as tourism serves to reinforce spatially-based criteria of inclusion that need now to be challenged. Mobilities are simultaneously creating and recreating relationships between many places and spaces, and thus conceptual understandings of tourism and home cannot be limited spatially because any chosen spatial boundaries would be inconsistent with the processes by which they are enacted. Practices and spatializations of tourism and home are not constructed in isolated spaces or by solely tangible means. It is therefore crucial that we now move beyond a map of acceptable spaces of tourism and home to consider manifestations of the

touristic and home as spatially mobile, tangible and intangible, and dependent upon relationships and differences that are established through the negotiation of multiple spaces and places.

Though tourism must be expanded to include practices in many spaces, and interactions with place, not all tourism will include these components equally. Rather, there will continue to be a continuum of touristic engagements, and future studies of tourism must examine marginal cases alongside more mainstream ones. It is now even more important to examine both marginal and mainstream examples of the touristic, so as to better conceptualize the distinctions between going to the international foods section of a grocery store and flying across the world to visit a local market. Such investigations can examine variances in the touristic over space and time, and consider how possibilities for touristic practices are related to repeated visits to spaces, or repeated interactions with place, or the unpredictable and uncontrollable elements of experiences.

### **Tourism throughout mobilities – towards new ontology and methodologies**

The rich cases of this study suggest the type of insights that have been overlooked due to the ontological and methodological frames of previous studies of tourism. By positing and naturalizing circular journeys between opposing spaces of home and away, traditional spatializations of tourism have helped to limit our understandings. As Hall has noted in a survey of articles published in *Tourism Geographies*, tourism is predominantly studied only in singular tourist destinations, while tourism generating regions, multiple destinations and intervening spaces of travel are left unaddressed (2005b: 93). Hall questions how studies of tourism can be deemed representative of the phenomenon when

they only consider one temporal and spatial phase of the travel process. Taking the mobility out of tourism to study it in one place is absurd for Van den Abbeele, who asserts that ‘a voyage cannot be restricted to or circumscribed within a place unless it is to cease being a voyage – that is, what necessarily implies a crossing of boundaries or a change of places. A voyage that stays in the same place is not a voyage’ (1992: xiv). Examinations of tourism must then, as Hall suggests, be extended to include the many alternate phases of tourism (2005b).

Though limited work within tourism studies has responded to Hall’s call, the memoirs of this study demonstrate a significant awareness of the many segments of travel mobilities. Memoir authors temporally and spatially extend the object of their discussion beyond the limits of most previous studies of tourism, speaking to activities in primary homes, second homes, previous homes, other sites visited in and around these locations, and the cars, trains, boats that are used in transit. The memoirs of this study illustrate that rich insight can stem from considering multiple spaces and extended timeframes. Furthermore, they suggest that the partitioning off studies of tourism into tourist destinations and singular trips may counter individuals’ own understandings of the connections between spaces.

Though Hall offers an important reminder of the importance of pushing understandings of tourism past the boundaries of isolated tourist spaces, his own understanding remains limited by an apparent desire to keep tourism isolated as a social phenomenon. He argues that tourism must be studied differently, and over greater time and space, yet he still acknowledges a separation between tourism and non-tourism trips or excursions. Considering the frame of human mobility in which tourism now occurs,

Hall argues, leads to the conclusion ‘that tourism needs to be recognized as just one form of temporary mobility occurring in space and time’ (2005b: 94). Though tourism does need to be considered alongside other mobilities, Hall suggests that tourism remains distinguishable from other types of temporary mobility, and potentially even unique in its space and time characteristics. As this paper has suggested, contemporary mobilities have had a profound affect upon understandings of tourism, and it is difficult if not impossible to definitively separate tourism from many other similar phenomena. Though tourism as an industry remains identifiable, touristic practices are not isolated within particular spaces or mobilities. Tourism is better understood then as a continuum of practices that can occur in many diverse spaces, interspersed throughout many types of mobilities.

When heeding Hall’s call to examine multiple phases then, we must ensure that the tourist generating regions identified within Hall’s model do not become equated with a static primary home. The problems of such a model have been discussed, and though a particular home space may be the apparent beginning of a touristic mobility, it is important to also acknowledge the role of other spaces and places in generating travel. We need to consider how tourist destinations may generate tourism themselves, or how extended travel can give way to a longing for the change of visiting a primary residence. Home might indeed be approached in a touristic manner upon return, with travel having allowed for a new perspective from which to observe the uniqueness of previously familiar everyday locations.

Though this reading of travel memoirs has opened up possibilities for new spatializations of tourism, eliminating the dichotomy of home and away and the imagined circular geography of tourism mobilities will not be an easy task. Indeed, the new

relationships between spaces and places that memoir authors construct remain couched in the language of home and away, with primary or current homes taking precedence over secondary or previous ones that are themselves 'away'. The tension, however, between this literary and conceptual binary and the narrative which refuses to obey its boundaries leaves space for productive re-readings of home and tourism. Studies of tourism must, as this paper has, also wade into this mire of contradictions in order to explore what new spatializations of tourism can contribute.

## **Conclusion**

This paper has suggested some of the opportunities that could be revealed by reconsidering spatializations of tourism and opening up boundaries to consider tourism as something occurring in many forms within a network of interconnected spaces and places. Space and place, rather than being fenced off as isolated objects of study, can be situated within a context of interactive mobilities and acknowledged as fundamentally interconnected and affective components of experience. Spatialization itself is not a fixed product but a continual process, and one that tourists and scholars continually participate in. As the Gables' visit to other Palladian villas re-frames their own second home, so too does a visit to India re-place Mukherjee's notions of both India and Canada. Those of us who study tourism could benefit from recognizing and participating more actively in the continual negotiations of conceptual spatializations. In addition, future studies will also benefit from the inclusion of multiple sites and the utilization of 'mobile methods' (Larsen et al., 2006: 6) that capture information about mobility and necessitate researchers' conceptual or physical mobility as well. Though not all individuals have

increasingly mobile lifestyles, taking care to address a broader range of possible mobilities in our studies will help to uncover new aspects of all types of tourism.

As has been shown, changing experiences of mobility provide a challenge to traditional spatializations of tourism. Though not all tourism involves significant interactions with home, the cases of return home and second home mobilities highlighted in this paper provide an excellent starting point for reconsidering the spatial assumptions within our treatments of tourism. They suggest that future studies of tourism must be careful to include mobilities that do not fit circular structures. Second homes, and likely many other spaces, can serve as tourism generating regions, and must not be dismissed as unacceptable or abnormal tourism mobilities.

Neither can homes be overlooked as sites for tourism. Blaise and Mukherjee's mobility to and within India reveals touristic interactions with other people's lives and homes, and highlights the importance of acknowledging both touristic and non-touristic components of mobilities. Tourism has long been associated with particular mobility paths, but it is no longer accurate to assume that mobilities are essentially or entirely touristic. Tourism must rather be recognized as something that occurs alongside practices of the everyday and of home.

This paper has also illustrated how spaces and places can be very interconnected within mobilities. It is thus important to investigate multiple spaces and places within our studies, and to consider how they affect experiences of tourism. Experiences with multiple homes and marginal cases of tourism draw our attention to the maps of acceptable spaces for tourism that have remained largely unchallenged. By re-considering



our labels and spatializations of tourism, we will open up new space for understanding tourism as appearing in complex mobilities and having not one, but many homes.

### **Acknowledgements:**

The research upon which this article draws was gratefully supported by a Canadian Graduate Scholarship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Many thanks to Rob Shields, Mike Crang and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on previous drafts of this article.

### **Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> In addition to being a challenge for individuals whose mobilities include multiple homes, the notion of home-based tourism mobilities is also problematic because of its cultural specificity. As Hammond notes, Western conceptions of home are often unsuitable in studies examining other cultural and spatial contexts (2004).

<sup>2</sup> Though authored by Carl and Sally Gable, Sally is the sole narrator within this text, and observations are framed within her first-person point of view.

<sup>3</sup> Though the use of 'second home' and 'primary home' as labels threatens to uphold the oppositional duality with which these categories are often attributed, in this case the aim is to discuss these spaces and places in order to deconstruct any notions of the primacy of one home over another and achieve a discussion of homes and tourism as spaces and places that are mobile, transitory, and similar in some ways.

### **Bibliography:**

- Adler, J. (1989) 'Origins of sightseeing', *Annals of Tourism Research* 16: 7-29.
- Bainbridge, J. (2002) *Above the sea: expat in China*. New York: Writers Club Press.
- Blaise, C. and B. Mukherjee (1977) *Days and nights in Calcutta*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bruner, E. (1994) 'Abraham Lincoln as authentic reproduction: a critique of postmodernism', *American Anthropologist* 96 (2): 397-415.
- Chambers, I. (1994) *Migrancy, culture, identity*. London: Routledge.
- Chiang, Y. (1977) *China revisited, after forty-two years*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Cohen, E. (1974) 'Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification', *Sociological Review* 22 (4): 527-555.
- Cohen, E. (1979) 'A phenomenology of tourist experiences', *Sociology* 13 (2): 179-201.
- Coles, T., D.T. Duval, and C.M. Hall (2005) 'Tourism, mobility, and global communities: new approaches to theorizing tourism and tourist spaces', pp. 463-481 in W.F. Theobald (ed.) *Global tourism*. (3rd edn.) New York: Elsevier.
- Coles, T. and D. Timothy (eds.) (2004) *Tourism, diasporas and space*. London: Routledge.

- Davis, J.S. (2005) 'Representing place: "deserted isles" and the reproduction of Bikini Atoll', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95 (3): 607-625.
- De Souza, R.-M. (2005) 'No place like home: returnee R&R (retention and rejection) in the Caribbean homeland', pp. 135-156 in R.B. Potter, D. Conway, and J. Phillips (eds.) *The experience of return migration: Caribbean perspectives*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- DeLyser, D. (2003) '"A walk through Old Bodie": presenting a ghost town in a tourism map', pp. 79-107 in S.P. Hanna and V.J. Del Casino Jr. (eds.) *Mapping tourism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Edensor, T. (1998) *Tourists at the Taj*. London: Routledge.
- Edensor, T. (2007) 'Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism', *Social and Cultural Geography* 8 (2): 199-215.
- Franklin, A. (2003) *Tourism: an introduction*. London: Sage.
- Gable, S. and C.I. Gable (2005) *Palladian days: finding a new life in a Venetian country house*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Gordon, C. (1989) *At the cottage*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Gordon, C. (2006) *Still at the cottage*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Greenblat, C.S. and J.H. Gagnon (1983) 'Temporary strangers: travel and tourism from a sociological perspective', *Sociological Perspectives* 26 (1): 89-110.
- Hall, C.M. (2005a) 'Reconsidering the geography of tourism and contemporary mobility', *Geographical Research* 43 (2): 125-139.
- Hall, C.M. (2005b) 'Time, space, tourism and social physics', *Tourism Recreation Research* 30 (1): 93-98.
- Hall, C.M. and A.M. Williams (eds.) (2002) *Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption*. London: Kluwer Academic.
- Hammond, L. (2004) 'Tigrayan returnees' notions of home: five variations on a theme', pp. 36-53 in F. Markowitz and A.H. Stefansson (eds.) *Homecomings: unsettling paths of return*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Hastrup, K. and K.F. Olwig (1997) 'Introduction', pp. 1-14 in K.F. Olwig and K. Hastrup (eds.) *Siting culture: the shifting anthropological object*. New York: Routledge.
- Hetherington, K. (1997) 'In place of geometry: the materiality of place', pp. 183-199 in K. Hetherington and R. Munro (eds.) *Ideas of difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Holland, P. and G. Huggan (1998) *Tourists with typewriters: critical reflections on contemporary travel writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kaltenborn, B.P. (1997) 'Nature of place attachment: a study among recreation homeowners in Southern Norway', *Leisure Sciences* 19: 175-189.
- Larsen, J., J. Urry, and K. Axhausen (2006) *Mobilities, networks, geographies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Liu, H. (2005) *The transnational history of a Chinese family: immigrant letters, family business, and reverse migration*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Löfgren, O. (1994) 'Learning to be a tourist', *Ethnologia Scandinavica* 24: 102-125.
- MacCannell, D. (1976) *The tourist: a new theory of the leisure class*. New York: Schocken Books.
- MacGregor, R. (2002) *Escape: in search of the natural soul of Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.

- MacGregor, R. (2005) *The weekender: a cottage journal*. Toronto: Penguin.
- McKay, I. (1988) 'Twilight at Peggy's Cove: towards a genealogy of "Maritimicity" in Nova Scotia', *Border/lines* 12: 28-37.
- Minca, C. and T. Oakes (eds.) (2006) *Travels in paradox: remapping tourism*. Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Mordue, T. (2005) 'Tourism, performance and social exclusion in "Olde York"', *Annals of Tourism Research* 32 (1): 179-198.
- Phillips, M. (1990) *I saw three Chinas*. Victoria, BC: Orca Book Publishers.
- Ritzer, G. and A. Liska (1997) 'McDisneyization' and 'post-tourism': complementary perspectives on contemporary tourism', pp. 96-109 in C. Rojek and J. Urry (eds.) *Touring cultures: transformations of travel and theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Shields, R. (1991) *Places on the margin: alternative geographies of modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Shields, R. (2003) *The virtual*. New York: Routledge.
- Svenson, S. (2004) 'The cottage and the city: an interpretation of the Canadian second home experience', pp. 55-74 in C.M. Hall and D.K. Müller (eds.) *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: between elite landscape and common ground*. Clevedon UK: Channel View Publications.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The tourist gaze: leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
- Van den Abbeele, G. (1992) *Travel as metaphor: from Montaigne to Rousseau*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Williams, D.R. (2002) 'Leisure identities, globalization, and the politics of place', *Journal of Leisure Research* 34 (4): 351-367.
- Williams, D.R. and B.P. Kaltenborn (1999) 'Leisure places and modernity: the use and meaning of recreational cottages in Norway and the USA', pp. 214-230 in D. Crouch (ed.) *Leisure/tourism geographies: practices and geographical knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- World Tourism Organization (2005) 'Adapting the national tourism satellite account (TSA) project to subnational levels: a discussion paper'. Madrid: World Tourism Organization Department of Statistics and Economic Measurement of Tourism.