Est. 1841 | YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Beard, Lynn, Scarles, Caroline and Tribe,
John (2016) Mess and method: Using ANT in tourism research.
Annals of Tourism Research, 60. pp. 97-110.

Downloaded from: http://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/4683/

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorksj.ac.uk

MESS AND METHOD: USING ANT IN TOURISM RESEARCH

Abstract

The use of actor-network thinking is increasingly evident in tourism research. ANT offers the researcher a practical, fieldwork-based orientation, emphasising detailed description of relationships between actors in practice. However, questions which arise for the researcher in using ANT are seldom confronted in the literature. This paper contributes to the growing ANT literature in tourism by identifying five 'character traits' relating to selection and use of method in ANT research. It uses an empirical case study to show how these traits are performative in the researcher's 'hinterland' of methodological choices, providing theoretical and practical reflections for future researchers. It ends by considering how acknowledging these traits in the account can demonstrate adherence to accepted criteria for research quality.

Key words: fieldwork, actor-network theory, method, research quality

1   INTRODUCTION

The publication of *Actor Network Theory and Tourism* (van der Duim, Ren and Jóhannesson, 2012) assembled a range of examples of the use of ANT in tourism research for the first time, a collection which has recently been augmented by the same editors (Jóhannesson, Ren and van der Duim, 2015) with a focus on the ontological politics of tourism development. Together, these collections provide a comprehensive overview of the contribution actor-network thinking can make to the understanding of tourism, and the growing number of papers reporting ANT-based tourism research appearing during the same period indicates that it has achieved considerable traction within the tourism academy.

These ideas have recently been applied in a range of tourism contexts, focusing on the contribution ANT can make to our understanding of the complexities of tourism networks (Jóhannesson, 2005; Ren, 2010b; Dredge, 2015). Within this it has been used to explore relational concepts, such as destination (Bærenholdt, 2012; Farias, 2012), entrepreneurship and

innovation (Arnaboldi and Spiller, 2010; Jóhannesson, 2007, 2012; Jóhannesson and Bærenholdt, 2008; Paget, Dimanche and Mounet, 2010;) and academic research (Ren, Pritchard and Morgan, 2010; Tribe, 2010), the role of non-human actors, such as wildlife (Rodger, Moore and Newsome, 2009); photographs (Larsen, 2005) and backpacks (Walsh and Tucker, 2009) in tourist practices, and in the making of destination images (Povilanskas and Armaitiene, 2011; Ren, 2011; Ren and Blichfeldt, 2011; Franklin, 2014). It has also been used in various studies which reassess the relationship between tourism and development (van der Duim, 2007b; van der Duim and Caalders, 2008; Hummel and van der Duim, 2012; Wearing and McDonald, 2002; Wearing, Wearing and McDonald, 2010).

Paralleling developments in social science disciplines related to tourism e.g. geography (Murdoch, 1994, 1998; Pryke, Rose and Whatmore, 2003); sociology (Law and Urry, 2004); social anthropology (Strathern, 1996; de Laet, 2000; Ingold, 2010), and organisational studies (e.g. Czarniawska and Hernes, 2005), ANT offers the tourism researcher a practical, fieldwork-based orientation (Jóhannesson, 2005), with its emphasis on detailed examination and description of relationships between actors in practice, offering 'examples, cases, and stories of how things work, of how relations and practices are ordered' (van der Duim, Ampumuza and Ahebwa, 2014: 590). It therefore aligns with a body of work which characterises tourism as a process through which places are ordered, performed and produced (Franklin, 2004; van der Duim, 2007a), and offers an opportunity to extend our understanding of the social relations of tourism, challenging our ontological stance by admitting non-human actors, and breaking down preconceptions about the social nature of tourism and its organisation (Ren, 2010a). This focus highlights the processes that work continuously to produce and maintain assemblages of human and non-human actors, characterised in a tourism context as 'tourismscapes', defined as the 'complex relationships across space and through time between networked people and things, offering alternative structures of power and relationships' (van der Duim, Peters and Wearing, 2005: 293).

ANT has been variously described as a method (Gad and Jensen, 2010), a methodological toolkit (van der Duim et al., 2012), and an analytical framework (Alcadipani and Hassard, 2010; Farias, 2012). Law characterises it as 'a disparate family of material-semiotic tools, sensibilities and methods of analysis' (Law, 2009: 141), while Mol (2010:261) sees it as a repertoire of 'sensitising terms, ways of asking questions and techniques for turning issues inside out or upside down'. In terms of tourism research, therefore, it is better seen as a translation device – an 'architecture' of

concepts through which a story is constructed (Oppenheim, 2007), rather than a philosophical and epistemological 'force-field' (Tribe, 2004).

In the contested methodological context outlined above, research design is itself characterised as an actor-network in which a 'method assemblage' is enrolled, bringing with it a 'hinterland' of 'pre-existing social and material realities' which inevitably determine, at least to some extent, the way such research is produced. (Law, 2004: 34) Within this assemblage, method choice is itself an inherently political act (Mol, 1999; Law, 2004; Law and Urry, 2004; Gad and Jensen, 2010; Jóhannesson et al., 2015) producing 'situated knowledges' (Haraway, 1988) which are framed both by the methods used in their elicitation, and by the researcher's own background knowledge and experience of the field of study.

Research based on ANT thinking is 'grounded in empirical case studies' (Law, 2009: 141). However, the issues which arise for the researcher in designing and executing ANT research have not, until recently (Ren, 2010a; Jóhannesson et al., 2014) been confronted in ANT accounts in the tourism literature. As a result, several key practical and theoretical issues relating to ANT-based fieldwork remain under-explored. This paper contributes to the growing ANT literature in tourism by identifying five key dimensions, which it represents as character 'traits', of the researcher role, highlighting the way these relate to selection and use of method in the design and execution of ANT-oriented fieldwork, and arguing that the recognition of these traits in the narrative account is an important determinant of quality by demonstrating the trustworthiness of the study.

This paper adopts an auto-ethnographic approach (Sparkes, 2000; Scarles, 2010) in analysing reflections on some issues arising from research design, method choice and data collection using personal experience of fieldwork in an ANT-based tourism case study carried out by the lead author in a tourism destination in North Wales. These reflections represent a 'set of empirical interferences' (Law and Singleton, 2013: 486), contextualised in relation to the current tourism literature, with recourse to the wider ANT literature in the social sciences in search of further guidance on research design and method choice. In drawing together methodological themes relating to ANT from several social science disciplines, we argue that asking questions about 'how some groups, people or other entities have come to define, illustrate, sell talk on behalf of or otherwise represent the tourism product or place instead of others' (Ren, 2010a: 201) requires

the researcher as fieldworker to adopt five 'character traits' which shape her approach to fieldwork:

1) rethinking 'the field' (Hall, 2009: 571) by tracing relations through time and space, in hybrid, 'non-territorial' environments (Ren et al., 2012: 21) independent of scale or location.

2) asking questions about the researcher role which take us beyond reflexivity to 'acting in the network' (Routledge, 2008).

3) seeking a different relationship between researcher and participant which challenges conventional notions of research design through the approach to sampling known as 'following the actors' (Latour, 2005).

4) making particular demands on choice and use of method in 'following' both human and non-human participants.

5) adopting an approach to analysis during fieldwork through identification and tracing of 'tokens'.

Although we do not suggest that these are specific to ANT research, and indeed acknowledge the input of ethnographic methodology in discussing these traits, it is argued here that these traits *in combination* provide a specific set of possibilities and associated opportunities and challenges that are significant when adopting ANT-based fieldwork.

2   ANT FIELDWORK IN PRACTICE: THE PURSUIT OF MESS

The story which follows emerged from an ANT-based case study where the key research question related to how we understand the role of tourism brokers in the networks of destination production (following actor-network thinking about destinations first discussed by Bærenholdt, Haldrup, Larsen and Urry, 2004; Bærenholdt, 2012 and Ren, 2011). The objective was to explore how the introduction of ideas about Slow Food into a local tourism economy would be translated in both the networks of food supply in the tourism industry in the area and in the wider networks of destination marketing and management.

The Slow Food movement began in Italy in 1986, and later inspired Cittaslow, which also started in Italy, in 1999. Cittaslow has the wider aim of improving quality of life in towns by encouraging

'slow' practices, not only in food production and consumption, but in other aspects such as transport and community living. Cittaslow is now an international movement, with members in 28 countries (Cittaslow International, nd). Cittaslow accreditation has a status which enables such towns to attract funding, particularly in Europe, to support their activities, including as part of its manifesto a commitment to develop tourism in Cittaslow towns.

The starting point for the case study was Llangollen, a small town and tourism 'honey pot' in North Wales, UK, whose local council had recently successfully applied to become a Cittaslow town. ANT was chosen as an appropriate approach for this study because of the focus on tracing 'food' and 'food ideas' as key actors in destination innovations. It was envisaged that following the progress of ideas about Slow Food would enrol other human and non-human actors into a network which could be traced to produce a study of tourism innovation and the key actors involved in the wider relationships of practice in the destination network. In terms of sampling, Llangollen was chosen as the starting point, and it was envisaged that the network would be traced over the course of a year's fieldwork, progressively enrolling a range of actors, including both the food itself, and also a range of ideas and practices relating to food production and to tourism development in the wider geographical area and beyond. The account which follows is an auto-ethnographic account of the lead author's experiences during the early stages of fieldwork for this project, and highlights questions which arose for her about *how* to proceed as the fieldwork got under way. As such, it highlights the importance of acknowledging the role of the researcher's methodological 'hinterland' in how such questions are answered, and the importance of the researcher own knowledge and assumptions in this (Law, 2000; 2004).

'The initial phase of data collection involved a review of ideas and practices related to Cittaslow and Slow Food, traced through web-based documentary searches, and an engagement, via the local council in Llangollen, with national representatives of the Cittaslow movement in the UK. This took me, at their invitation, to the AGM of Cittaslow UK, involving a long train journey from North Wales to York in the engaging, helpful and informative company of the Chair of Cittaslow UK, and an opportunity to meet with representatives from Cittaslow towns throughout the UK. Llangollen itself was not represented at the meeting, which seemed to surprise the other delegates, so I was seen as the Llangollen representative (I had arrived at the meeting bearing a characteristic Welsh *bara brith* as my contribution to the lunch offering, which was to be based on local food from the member towns and their areas). Discussion at the meeting centred on issues relating to maintaining the strict

requirements of the Cittaslow Charter, and the difficulties of ensuring continuity as various local (and in the UK unpaid) councillors came and went in the different towns involved.

I was already a long way from home (in terms of my research question), and wondering whether what I was doing was strictly relevant to my project. However, I was learning a lot about the practices and issues involved in the acquisition and maintenance of Cittaslow status, and 'local food' and its relationship with the visitor economy seemed to play a key role in this in most of the towns involved. As I listened and participated in the meeting, and throughout the long train journey back, I asked myself what 'following the actors' required that I do in this case. Do I follow Cittaslow as an actor and engage with these other towns, spread all over the UK, and see how they have engaged with Slow Food issues in their local tourism, or do I stick to my original plan and focus on the specific initiative in North Wales and hope that my disparate findings from my day in York might contribute to my account as I returned to trace 'Slow Food' in my chosen destination?

Eventually opting to follow my original objectives, a few weeks later, at the invitation of the Town Council, I attended the annual Town Meeting in Llangollen, where the local community was invited to learn about the successful Cittaslow application, to find out what it meant for the local council and the residents of the town, and to be presented with a symbolic model snail from Cittaslow UK as a token of their membership of the organisation. After the presentations, explanatory leaflets were offered to interested residents, and an invitation issued to volunteer for the new Cittaslow committee which was to take the project forward. Everything seemed to be well on track. At the meeting, I introduced myself and made arrangements to interview the members of the separate Slow Food committee which had been formed as part of the Cittaslow application, and to attend some of their meetings in preparation for a planned 'Slow Food Week' to be held at the start of the summer tourism season .

Later that week, during the first of these interviews, I found myself volunteering (unsolicited) to conduct a survey about food supply among local tourism accommodation providers, which would not only provide me with access to a key set of informants and their networks, but would also contribute to the local Slow Food campaign by forging connections with local tourism brokers. This was ANT in action – I was 'following the actors', 'tracing the tokens' and 'acting in the network'. What could go wrong?

At this point it is worth noting that I had already assumed that the Slow Food team (which included local residents who were also tourism professionals) would be linking with the tourism industry in the town, that the supply of food to tourism establishments would be part of their role (at the time, both requirements of the Cittaslow Charter), and that the tourism providers would be interested in this new initiative to improve the tourism offering in the town. As it turned out, none of these things were true, and the nascent Slow Food committee collapsed and died within three months. No Slow-Food-based tourism innovation would take place in Llangollen during the period of my fieldwork.

How to proceed at this point? Which actors should I follow from here? My research question related to the networks of tourism production. Should I trace the 'food and tourism' idea elsewhere? I had already unearthed some interesting tourism initiatives involving food in the wider local area, and had discovered a strong food narrative in tourism promotion both locally and through the policies of the national DMO, Visit Wales, and its regional marketing organisations. Or should I look at tourism in Llangollen afresh and focus instead on the absences which had resulted in the failure of the Slow Food idea to translate into anything concrete, into a durable actor-network, in this particular case? Keeping my focus on the broader question of destination networks suggested that I should move away from 'food' and seek to identify and follow human and non-human actors which were actively mediating tourism in the area. But I had already amassed some interesting data and informants relating to food initiatives in tourism, and was reluctant to abandon these entirely.'

The researcher's responses to these issues in this example eventually led to an adjustment of the research question to focus on absences in the destination networks of Llangollen and the surrounding area. This emphasis on networks which do not achieve durability itself offers a productive approach to tourism research, and is one which we plan to explore further in future publications. However, for the purposes of this discussion, this account shows how an innovation in a tourism destination can be understood using the key concepts of ANT - ordering, translation and mediation - and describes how the researcher's intentions were challenged when data refused to be 'collected' as planned. In particular, it shows how the stories told by the data may not always be the answers to the questions originally asked by the researcher, and demonstrates the requirement to be flexible in accommodating this in research design and the production of the account. In reflecting on the decisions made about how to proceed, and in particular about which actors to 'follow', the importance of the five ANT

researcher 'character traits' outlined earlier became apparent, and therefore emerged as an important part of the account itself. In the discussion which follows, each of these traits is explored in more depth, with reference to the case study and to insights from the wider ANT literature, and their relation to the quality of research output is assessed.

3   MESS AND METHOD IN ANT RESEARCH DESIGN

'Method is not, and never could be, innocent or purely technical' (Law, 2004: 143).

Research design is concerned with the way a research question becomes a research project (Robson, 2011). It is seen as a 'road map' for achieving coherence throughout the project, and relates to decisions about methodology, research strategy and timescale for data collection as well as method choice. Robson argues that in qualitative research, design needs to provide a set of flexible guidelines about things which need to be thought about and borne in mind, calling for a concern for design throughout the project, rather than just at the beginning. He suggests that 'the detailed framework of the design *emerges* during the study' (Robson, 2011: 72, *original italics*). Maxwell (2013) agrees, arguing that, in qualitative research, design is interactive rather than linear, centred on rather than starting with the research question, and subject to continuous processes of revision as the study progresses, recursively developing ideas about method and how it is used while maintaining consistency of theoretical and methodological commitments throughout.

As noted above, it has been suggested that ANT provides a 'methodological toolbox' within an ordering framework, but rather than specifying what methods to use, it shows *how* those methods are to be used, and guides our choices about how the data will be interpreted: 'ANT is not a theory about what the social is made of but is rather a method that enables one to give actors voice and to learn from them without pre-judging their activities' (Gad and Jensen, 2010: 62). The discussion which follows explores ways in which the five 'character traits' of the ANT researcher-actor shape both the emergent research design and the methods chosen to give voice to the actors in the network.

Trait 1: Rethinking "the field"

'From a relational approach, any given field of research is an effect of research practice…' (Jóhannesson et al., 2015:10)

Most studies using ANT in tourism take the form of case study design, using predominantly ethnographic methods to collect data about the roles and relations of different actors. Through this data, 'actors and their relations, strength, importance and ability to speak, act and represent is established' (Ren et al., 2012: 20). Detailed description based on ethnographic data, it is argued, 'deconstructs taken-for granted categories of analysis…[and] …demonstrate[s] the complexity and entanglement of places, events, phenomena, actors and objects' (Ren et al., 2012: 20). Observation has a particularly significant role to play, not only in collecting data relating to non-human informants, but also in the important task of describing what is excluded from the network as well as what is included (Ren, 2010a).

In these respects, ANT research aligns with developments in ethnography which were first discussed by Gupta and Ferguson (1997), and are now produced through a number of disciplines, including social anthropology (e.g. Ingold, 2011) and geography (e.g. Massey, 2003; Cresswell, 2013). These approaches resist traditional ethnographic assumptions about the 'group' to be studied, about where it begins and ends, and about who the participants will be, instead encompassing notions of mobility and fluidity, of both the field and the researcher. Reflecting the materiality of the social, 'the field' is therefore framed as the 'range' of the object under study, 'a space that is transformed by the travel of objects and an observer on-the move (de Laet, 2000: 168).

Haldrup and Larsen (2010: 40) argue that much ethnographic research in tourism adopts approaches which are 'incapable of capturing the role of heterogeneous flows in enabling particular sites', and note that one of the challenges facing the ANT researcher is the danger of 'erecting walls and neglecting connections and movement in and out of the site'. The need, as shown in the discussion of theoretical contributions above, to move beyond a bounded ethnographic field, to go where the action is, is illustrated in the case study by the trip to York. This trip and its outcomes show how 'the action' can move in unexpected ways, offering the researcher unanticipated opportunities to collect material which seems to align with her own research questions and objectives, or to suggest alternative way of looking at the materials which

might shed light on the same questions. This demonstrates the geographical mobility of 'the field', (Massey, 2003) but also shows how we construct 'the field' as researchers based on the 'hinterland' which shapes negotiation about who and what to engage with (Law, 2004; Riles, 2000).

Ren (2010a) suggests that this approach has much in common with multi-sited ethnography (Marcus, 1995). However, in one example of such a study in social anthropology Hannerz (2003) shows that ethnography can be both multi-sited and yet still 'confined' in terms of time, space and participant identity. Massey (2003) argues that in ANT, the field exists in spaces other than the geographical:

> 'The field', then, begins to seem less like a space which one goes to and subsequently leaves. Rather, it is a much more complex structure which one transforms; it is still present, in transformed form, in your written report, and the processes of transforming it are present, too, in every operation 'within' the field. (Latour, 1999, paraphrased by Massey, 2003: 83)

ANT therefore requires a conceptualisation of the field which is open not only to multiple geographical localities, but also to the fluid nature of the creation, maintenance and breaking down of relationships between the actors in these localities and beyond. It requires of the researcher a flexibility of approach which can accommodate and respond to new directions which open up, rather than excluding or disregarding them. The decision in the case study about whether to 'follow' the Slow Food/tourism 'gathering' away from the planned site of data collection had important practical implications in terms of both time and financial resources, and it is important to acknowledge that these were important factors in the way the fieldwork unfolded. The case study therefore shows how, during fieldwork, the researcher is called upon to decide not only on *whether*, but also on *how* to follow her chosen actors, decisions which ultimately shape the nature of the field and the data which results.

Trait 2: Researcher role ('acting in the network')

Massey's quote above also provides a link to the second key character trait of the ANT researcher: the active role she plays in *transforming* 'the field' through the processes of data

collection and analysis. In tourism research a consensus has emerged that researcher reflexivity is fundamental to new and 'emancipatory' approaches to qualitative research which provide greater freedom in choosing how particular methods will be used, while at the same time raising personal and political issues which 'situate' the researcher (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004; Ateljevic, Pritchard and Morgan, 2007). It is widely agreed that this requires the researcher to be 'doubly reflexive', looking inwards to herself and outwards to the research relationships she is creating, and acknowledging the 'entanglements' which shape her approach to research (Ateljevic, Harris, Wilson and Collins, 2005; Feighery, 2006; Westwood, Morgan and Pritchard, 2006).

However, in ANT research, the way the researcher decides to engage with her study is seen as a political act which shapes the resultant account of 'the social'. 'The researcher… is not just observing, s/he is actively constructing what it is being studied' (Alcadipani and Hassard, 2010: 10). This challenges the researcher's choice about who is 'heard' and who is not 'heard', requiring a different relationship between researcher and participant: 'We let them [actors] show us where to look, what material they use in the course of network construction and how they come to be related to others' (Murdoch, 1994: 23). The significance of this is further elaborated by Whatmore (2003) when she speaks of the researcher's role in the field as *generating materials*, rather than *collecting data*. 'Data emerge … not as nuggets of the "real world", or as so many "discursive constructs", but rather as intermediaries or "third parties" between researcher and researched' (96). However, as shown above, relinquishing control to the data in this way is difficult for the researcher to achieve in practice, given the centrality of her own decisions about how the resulting materials are to be interpreted and used.

Routledge (2008) argues that ANT research takes us beyond reflexivity to a place where, as researchers, we need to acknowledge that we are active 'in' the networks we are researching, continually engaged in a series of small decisions which build and shape data collection and narrative output as we go. Routledge adds an additional dimension to the discussion above about 'the field' required to articulate 'not so much my position in the field, as the way the field is both within and without myself' (Riles, 2000:20). The research described by Riles and Routledge respectively describes scenarios where the researcher was a political activist within global networks of resistance. However, our case study demonstrates that this level of political activism is not a prerequisite for 'acting in the network'. In this example, the researcher was regarded by

the other participants at the Cittaslow meeting as a representative of Llangollen, even though she was not attending the meeting on this basis. Her subsequent involvement with the developing (unsuccessful) Slow Food network, through volunteering her services as a researcher, was more as an additional communication channel rather than as an intentional political activist, but her potential to act as a mediator in shaping the object of study, if the Slow Food project had gone on to become a functioning and durable actor-network, was clear nonetheless.

Trait 3: Following the actors

The starting point for ANT research is the situated researcher and the questions she asks. From this starting point, ANT advocates an approach known as 'following the actors' (Latour, 2005), a form of snowball sampling in which actor-networks are identified and followed by the researcher. The identification of participants is therefore an integral part of the process of generating materials, rather than a preliminary planning stage in research design, and is intimately linked with the process of data analysis from the outset, as the significance of particular actors becomes clear only as the networks emerge (Jóhannesson, 2005). Neither, as we have seen, is it possible to identify *where* these actors will be found. 'Instead of demarcating the field prior to its description, feedback from the field must guide and point on to the following places, objects, practices or discourses suited for further description' (Ren, 2010a: 206). This creates significant challenges relating to how as researchers we 'allow' or enable' our participants to show us where to go next. These dilemmas are clearly shown in the case study where, even at a very early stage of the project, the researcher found herself confronted by choices which could have taken her away from her original research objectives, possibly into a new and more interesting question, but equally possibly into a blind alley.

This approach to enrolling participants also raises questions about where the study 'ends'. The question of where and how to cut the network belongs to a later chapter of this story, but is included here to illustrate one of the key questions relating to this particular trait. As shown in the literature (Latour, 1988; Strathern, 1996) actor-networks are theoretically without limit, so how do we decide what is 'enough' data for a complete study?

The convention in qualitative research is that data saturation is reached when further data collection yields little or no new information or themes, but arrival at this point is seldom clear-cut in practice (Yin, 2013). Arguments in ANT about how to 'cut' the network by stopping data

collection are recognised in the literature as important (Strathern, 1996; Ren et al., 2012; van der Duim, 2007a), but how the question is resolved is unclear. Strathern (1996: 523) asserts that the 'end point' of data collection emerges from analysis: 'analysis, like interpretation, must have a point; it must be enacted as a stopping place'. However, other ANT writers think differently: 'The boundaries are left open and are closed only when the people being followed close them' (van der Duim, 2007a: 971). Verschoor (1997) describes his own approach: that data collection can stop when 'the tactics, the strategies – in short, the practices – of the [informants] I followed are displayed. Until the display is saturated. And then I stop' (58). Verschoor identified the point where description turns into explanation as the point where the network ends, while admitting that this point may be difficult to identify in practice.

A further consideration emerges in a study which aims to understand the workings of power as a network effect, when understanding the connections which produce power becomes a factor in deciding where to 'cut'. Latour relates power to the level of connectivity within actor-networks: 'the small is being unconnected, the big one is to be attached' (Latour, 2005: 180), suggesting that, in seeking to describe the network role of 'big' actors, we have to 'follow' more things along more connections than for a 'small' one. Gad and Jensen (2010: 77) suggest that the decision about where to cut the network is, of necessity, made by the researcher, 'inevitably assisted by practical conditions as well as intellectual considerations about what one wants to achieve'. This is a pragmatic view, and one which the academic constraints of producing research (as noted in the discussion in Trait 1 above) would tend to support.

Trait 4: Embracing materiality ('Following' non-human actors)

The 'analytical levelling' (Ren, 2010a: 200) or symmetry between people and things is a key dimension of ANT, and has been particularly productive in generating new ways of thinking about tourism. Haldrup and Larsen (2006) contend that the role of things has been consigned by postmodern social theory to their symbolic value, rather than acknowledging the 'use-value' of a wide range of objects, machines and technologies which enable and therefore have the potential to empower, human actors: 'Discourses, sensuous bodies, machines, objects, animals and places are choreographed *together* and build heterogeneous cultural orders that have the capacity to act, to have effects and affects' (Haldrup and Larsen, 2006: 278, *original italics*). Ingold (2010) extends this by exploring the difference between 'things' and 'objects', and suggesting that 'things' include not only the material object, but also the gatherings of ideas, practices and meanings that

accompany them. Picken speaks of the need for humans and non-humans to share the same analytical space in tourism research, enabling a methodology that gives 'co-performing non-humans a say' (Picken, 2010: 259).

The materiality of place therefore becomes central to ANT research in tourism. Tourism 'things' – signs, communications media and technologies, as well as ideas, discourse and knowledge – are seen to act as mediators in tourism networks. Admitting non-human actors also raises questions about how we understand tourism places:

> Destinations are … often less coherent and more contingent and decentralised than the images and brands made by "destination actors". The networks and flows involved in attracting, mobilising, servicing, accommodating and entertaining tourists are much more complex and multi-layered than envisioned by the idea of some kind of fit between a geographical area, specific actors and a marketing 'destination organisation'…
> (Bærenholdt, 2012:111)

As we have seen, non-human informants can include a wide range of media as well as objects, including photos, minutes from meetings, advertisements, news articles, sketches, drawings, e-mails and written speeches and presentations (Jóhannesson, 2005; Ren et al., 2012). But what does 'following' mean? And (from personal experience, the question most frequently asked by non-ANT researchers) how do you follow 'things'? Does this make particular demands in terms of method? Lury, in pioneering the exploration of the role of objects in tourism (Lury, 1997), advocates a form of 'following' in tracing the career, or biography of objects. Lash and Lury (2007) suggest the following approach to developing a 'sociology of the object':

> 'Very simply, you find out as much about them in as many places in time and space from as many points of view as possible…[using] not only situational observation but also processes of observation that [are] attentive to the temporality of the …objects concerned (Lash and Lury, 2007: 20)

However, Lash and Lury contextualise objects predominantly in relation to their cultural meanings, and trace how these meanings can be mobile within object-people practices in tourism. In terms of methodology, they identify 'point of view' as the most important factor in 'seeing' the object from as many different standpoints as possible. ANT looks beyond this semiotic stance to look at 'things' in terms of their connections and relationships – their 'use

value'. In attempting to flesh out a specifically ANT approach to following objects, Latour (2005) notes that:

> 'Objects, by their very nature of their connections with humans, quickly shift from being mediators [active translators] to being intermediaries [passive]. This is why specific tricks have to be invented to *make them talk*…to offer descriptions of themselves, to produce scripts of what they are making others – humans and non-humans - do' (Latour, 2005: 79, *original italics*)

Latour talks of 'triggering the occasions' where things can be made to talk, by studying innovation and change in actor-networks ('it is only once in place that they disappear from view' (80)), including accidents, breakdowns or strikes, and the role of what he terms 'risky objects', 'when completely silent intermediaries become full-blown mediators' (80).

The choice of an innovation as a research focus in the case study was therefore an attempt to trigger 'food' as an actor in a tourism network, and to 'make it talk' through the innovation Slow Food Llangollen. It was envisaged that networks involving human actors, objects (food, tourism products) and ideas (Slow Food and tourism policies relating to local food production and consumption) would make themselves available for study, and that the methods chosen, mainly observation and interview, narrative and documentary analysis, would enable them to do this. As it happened, in this case, 'food' did not act through Slow Food as the researcher expected, but it later resurfaced as an actor elsewhere via a revised research question as the project progressed.

Trait 5: Employing method in analysis ('tracing tokens')

The fifth trait relates to understanding what 'following the actors' means in terms of data interpretation and analysis, a subject which is seldom broached in ANT accounts. The key mediator in an actor-network has been characterised through the concept of the 'token', defined as an actor which 'both constructs the network and is simultaneously transformed by the developing network' (Gaskell and Hepburn, 1998: 65). Latour (1993) characterises tokens as 'quasi-objects' (51), which are 'simultaneously real, discursive, contested and socially constructed' (Nhamo, 2010: 466). In Gaskell and Hepburn's work, the token is an assemblage of ideas, in this case an academic course. They trace the progress of the development of a new course by charting the way an assemblage of ideas is either taken up or ignored by individuals who see their

interests translated within it. As the token is modified by association with these individuals, so the network develops, grows and is itself changed. In Nhamo's paper, the token is the 'global warming and climate change' narrative, which attracts different groupings of actors through different leadership agendas relating to the token, in this example highlighting the potential political role of the token in the network (Nhamo, 2010).

A token is therefore defined as 'a semiotic representation of an actor network, which circulates and is translated in the course of circulations performing the actor-network' (Povilanskas and Armitiene, 2011: 1161). This study, which is the first to employ the concept of tracing the token explicitly in tourism research, identifies and traces tokens through a combination of documentary analysis, qualitative semi-structured interviews and a quantitative survey. In this way, the 'things' identified as tokens (e.g. 'cheap sun', 'robust environment') are traced through analysis of printed tourism literature, local tourism practice and visiting tourist choice to produce an understanding of destination regeneration using ANT.

These examples also illustrate the iterative and interrelated nature of materials generation and analysis in ANT research. The identification of tokens is an important analytical step, which can take place at a very early stage in the research process. In our case study, the token 'Slow Food' was chosen at the outset as an actor consisting of 'things' and 'ideas' which would perform in different ways through the network of tourism supply and production, in the manner of a tracer dye through the networks it was constructing. However, it proved difficult to 'make it talk' in the manner anticipated at the outset, as it disappeared without trace in the original location, but suggested a move to other locations (the other UK Cittaslow towns) where it would be sure to re-emerge and re-connect.

Tokens can therefore be seen as a form of password to understanding an actor-network, and are, as such, a significant focus for materials generation using different, and possibly mixed methods as noted above. This perspective crucially also enables us to trace informants as they perform through time, using a 'historically reflective ANT' (Corrigan and Mills, 2012) in which the past itself is an actant (the 'human and material factors that encourage people to act' (Corrigan and Mills, 2012: 251)). This approach suggests that we can only be in touch with the past through a combination of traces, so 'we are influenced by dominant versions of the past and our interaction with those versions' (Corrigan and Mills, 2012: 253). The role of tokens in tracing the

performance of gatherings of ideas and things through time was recently also demonstrated in tourism by Franklin (2014), tracing the agency of 'bucket and spade' as a significant foundational element in understanding the tourism space known as 'the beach', and the British beach holiday. In Franklin's study, 'bucket and spade' becomes a 'token' whose relationships can be traced through the history of British beach holidays, showing how 'objects bring other times and other spaces into the here and now' (Murdoch, 1998: 360).

Tracing tokens therefore becomes both method and analysis, with the effect of drawing the other four traits together, helping the researcher acting in the network to define the field of study by generating materials through the actors and their associations. Taken together, the five traits therefore play a significant role in situating the researcher's own 'hinterland' within the account, and the implications of this for demonstrating research quality are discussed below.

4   QUALITY, CHOICES AND VALUES IN ANT RESEARCH

In qualitative social research, it is now axiomatic that we recognise the values underpinning our approach to enquiry (Tribe, 2009; Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2011) in order to justify our philosophical and methodological choices, and to demonstrate the quality of the research that results. The position and role of the researcher, the nature of interpretive analysis, and the way the story is told are therefore important considerations in determining quality: 'interpretation is not simply an individual cognitive act, but a social and political practice' (Schwandt, 2007: 12).

Hardy, Phillips and Clegg (2001) contend that researcher reflexivity goes beyond recognising the positionality of the individual researcher, but also involves acknowledging the role of the academic community of which the researcher is a part: 'The researcher is subjected to and resistant to the controls embedded in the research process, and neither the research subject nor the researcher can escape them' (Hardy et al., 2001: 536). Among these 'controls' is a view of what constitutes 'good' research, based on criteria 'accepted' within the research community. Lincoln and Guba (1985) established that in contrast with positivist research approaches, the main criteria for quality in interpretive research are the extent to which it can be regarded as *trustworthy*, (the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability and neutrality replacing the positivist criteria of internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity) and *authentic*, demonstrating 'reflexive awareness of oneself as the researcher, and appreciation and

understanding of the position and perspective of others – the researched, the participants and the reader' (Westwood et al., 2006: 38).

Reports of ANT research are often lucid, highly readable and detailed accounts, in the form of stories with single or multiple threads which draw together the different themes of their study, presented as a narrative on how the ideas of ANT are translated through the chosen research topic (e.g. Ren, 2011). 'A good ANT account is a narrative or a description or a proposition where all the actors *do something* and don't just sit there' (Latour, 2005: 128*, original italics*). The production of the account becomes an activity in which analytical tools are applied to narrative knowledge produced by the researcher (Alcadipani and Hassard, 2010). The voice of the researcher is therefore dominant in 'speaking for' the human and non-human entities studied. Data collected is identifiable through direct quotes from relevant literature, as extracts from interview transcripts, or more commonly as some form of visual evidence.

The perceived quality of ANT research output therefore appears to reside in the transparency of the accounts of data collection, analysis and interpretation, and the full acknowledgement of the active role of the researcher as co-creator throughout the process. The trustworthiness and authenticity of the account rely on the clarity and openness with which the processes of enquiry and interpretation are presented (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Westwood et al*.,* 2006). However, we have seen in the discussion above that 'reflexivity' itself can, as Law (in considering Haraway's concept of 'situated knowledges') suggests, itself be seen as 'a form of mythology' (Law, 2000:4). Instead, he argues that 'we acknowledge and come to terms, somehow or other, with the specificity of our own knowledges, our situations' without resorting to 'self-revelation' (Law, 2000:5) – of acknowledging 'the personal' without 'being' personal. This approach is evident in many ANT-based accounts (e.g. Law, 2000; Law and Singleton, 2005; 2013) which highlight ways in which the researcher mediates the translations producing the research project as an effect or outcome, an approach which is also taken in the case study account provided above. We therefore argue that the five traits discussed here can be considered as examples of what Law calls 'practices of knowledge-relevant embodiment' (Law, 2000: 8), and as such, are an important ingredient of a trustworthy account.

5   CONCLUSION

It has been suggested that although ANT offers 'fresh and unconventional vistas for tourism research', in practice 'a partial hiatus exists between innovative theory and rather conventional approaches in empirical research' (Cohen and Cohen, 2012: 2186). This paper counters this criticism by examining the detailed implications for empirical research practice of adopting an ANT-based approach to tourism research, and by suggesting how this hiatus may be bridged. In conclusion, therefore, we emphasise the contribution of five ANT researcher 'character traits' to shaping method choice and use, and highlight their important role in demonstrating research quality in ANT research.

The account provided above as a 'tale from the field' shows how the decision to adopt ANT thinking in tourism research brings these traits into play. Acknowledging these traits in the research account is important, enabling the researcher to bring 'the personal' into the account without straying into self-revelation. It also illustrates how assumptions made at the outset of a research project may become redundant, not because of any failure in background research or literature analysis and research design, but because things just didn't turn out that way, and acknowledges that such assumptions should also be drawn into the account to show the role played by the 'hinterland' of the researcher's background and understanding (Law, 2004: 12).

In thinking about the first trait, 'locating "the field"', the example provided demonstrates the fluid nature of ANT research design, and shows the dynamic nature of the field, and in particular how it can change as a result of decisions made by the researcher in response to unanticipated outcomes throughout the study. There are examples too of the second trait, 'acting in the network', showing how the researcher, in engaging not only with the object of study, but also with the people, organisations and things that constitute that object, becomes the study, creating an actor-network that endures for the period of research, then ceases once it ends. The act of snowballing entailed in adopting the third trait, 'following the actors', also involves a series of negotiations which have the potential to change the nature of the network. Finally, the account explores issues relating to the fourth and fifth traits in choosing and following objects as tokens, tracing networks of human and non-human actors. This relates to decisions the researcher makes about 'the field', and also about which actors to follow, which networks to pursue, and the relationship of this issue to the requirements of the academic research process, and, more pragmatically, to the requirements of research funding.

The scenario discussed in the case study relates to just a small section of the research project in question, covering only the first stages of fieldwork and data collection, and the discussion provided above has highlighted several ways in which these ideas can be developed through further research. In particular, a focus on networks which do not achieve durability offers a productive approach to tourism research, and is one which we plan to explore further in future publications. In terms of method, the question of where and how to cut the network, and the role of the token in analysis and materials generation raises questions which further research can clarify. And finally, we need to examine further how we employ the voice of the researcher is in 'speaking for' the human and non-human entities studied.

Despite the theorists' exhortations to embrace mess, the untidiness that accompanies ANT fieldwork is seldom apparent in finished accounts of ANT research. In recognising the challenges of opening up to the 'rich material texture' of tourism through actor-network thinking, Ren (2010a: 206) admits that answering questions about what to 'allow' into our study and how to restrict admission of actors to enable the story to be told as 'admittedly a little frightening!' – a characterisation which is certainly reflected in the lead author's first steps in ANT fieldwork described above, with the ever present doubt – (am I still on track to answer my question?), and the temptation to be lured away by the network, to constantly ask – is this direction going to work for me?

Confronting this fear entails an acceptance that some of the familiar elements of the academic research process may be dissonant with an ANT approach, creating tensions which need to be accommodated in the interests of quality control: between 'following the actors', re-imagining the field' and the practicalities of doing research; between the need for flexibility and restrictions of funding and the necessity of keeping to a pre-agreed plan; between 'acting in the network' and the quality criteria of trustworthiness and authenticity, and finally in constructing a narrative which does justice to our analytical themes while maintaining a trustworthy tale of 'mess'.

References

Alcadipani, R. and Hassard, J. (2010) 'Actor-Network Theory, organisations and critique: towards a politics of organising'. *Organization*, 17(3): 1-17.

Arnaboldi, M. and Spiller, N. (2011) 'Actor-network theory and stakeholder collaboration: The case of Cultural Districts', *Tourism Management*, 32: 641-654.

Ateljevic, I. Harris, C., Wilson, E. and Collins, F.L. (2005) 'Getting "Entangled": Reflexivity and the "Critical Turn" in Tourism Studies'. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30(2): 9-21.

Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (2007) (eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Innovative Research Methods*. London: Elsevier

Bærenholdt, J. O. (2012) 'Enacting destinations: the politics of absence and presence'. *In* van der Duim, R., Ren, C. and Jóhannesson, G.T. (eds) *Actor-Network Theory and Tourism: ordering, materiality and multiplicity*, pp. 111-127. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bærenholdt, J.O., Haldrup, M., Larsen, J. and Urry, J. (2004) *Performing Tourist Places*. Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Cittaslow (nd*) Cittaslow International Charter*. Available at: http://www.cittaslow.org/download/DocumentiUfficiali/Charter_06_2011.pdf. Accessed 25 June 2015.

Cohen, E. and Cohen, S. (2012) 'Current sociological theories and issues in tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4): 2177-2202.

Corrigan, L.T. and Mills, A.J. (2012) 'Men on board: Actor-Network Theory, feminism and gendering the past'. *Management and Organizational Theory*, 7(3): 251-265.

Cresswell, T. (2013) *Place: a short introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Czarniawska, B. and Hernes, T. (2005) *Actor-Network Theory and Organising*. Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.

De Laet, M. (2000) 'Patents, travel, space: ethnographic encounters with objects in transit', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 18(2): 149-168.

Dredge, D. (2015) Tourism-planning network knowledge dynamics. *In*: McLeod, M. and Vaughan, R. (eds) *Knowledge Networks and Tourism*, pp. 9-27. Abingdon, Routledge.

Farias, I. (2012) 'Destinations as virtual objects of tourism communication'. *In* Van der Duim, R., Ren, C. and Jóhannesson, G.T. (eds) *Actor-Network Theory and Tourism: ordering, materiality and multiplicity,* pp. 128-145. Abingdon: Routledge.

Feighery, W. (2006) 'Reflexivity and Tourism Research: Telling An(other) Story'. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(3): 269-282.

Franklin, A. (2004) 'Tourism as an ordering: towards a new ontology of tourism', *Tourist Studies*, 4(3): 277-301.

Franklin, A. (2014) 'On why we dig the beach: Tracing the subjects and objects of bucket and spade for a relational materialist theory of the beach'. *Tourist Studies*, 14(3): 261-285.

Gad, C. and Jensen, C.B. (2010) 'On the Consequences of Post-ANT". *Science, Technology and Human Values*, 35(1): 55-80.

Gaskell, J. and Hepburn, G. (1998) 'The Couse as Token: A Construction of/by Networks', *Research in Science Education*, 28(1): 65-76.

Goodson, L. and Phillimore, J. 'The inquiry paradigm in qualitative tourism research'. *In* Phillimore, J. and Goodson, L. (eds) *Qualitative Research in Tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, pp.30-45. London: Routledge.

Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (1997) 'Discipline and practice: "The field" as site, method and location in anthropology'. *In* Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (eds) *Anthropological locations: boundaries and grounds of a field science, pp. 146.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haldrup, M. and Larsen, J. (2006) 'Material Cultures of Tourism'. *Leisure Studies*, 25(3): 275-289.

Haldrup, M. and Larsen, J. (2010) *Tourism, Performance and the Everyday: Consuming the Orient*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Hall, T. (2009) 'Footwork: moving and knowing in local space(s)'. *Qualitative Research*, 9(5): 571-585.

Hannerz, U. (2003) 'Being there…and there…and there…! Reflections on multi-site ethnography'. *Ethnography*, 4(2): 201-216.

Hardy, C., Phillips, N. and Clegg, S. (2001) 'Reflexivity in Organisation and Management Theory: a Study of the Production of the Research 'Subject'. *Human Relations*, 54(5): 531-560.

Haraway, D. (1988) 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective'. *Feminist Studies, 14(3): 575-599.*

Hummel, J. and van der Duim, R. (2012) 'Tourism and development at work: 15 years of tourism and poverty reduction within the SNV Netherlands Development Organisation', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(3): 319-338.

Ingold, T. (2011) *Being Alive: Essays on movement, knowledge and description*. London: Routledge.

Ingold, T. (2010) *'Bringing Things to Life: Creative Entanglements in a World of Materials'.* ESRC National Centre for Research Methods: Working Paper 15. Manchester: NCRM. Available at http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/1306/1/0510_creative_entanglements.pdf. Accessed 20 January 2016.

Jóhannesson, G.T. (2005) 'Tourism translations: Actor-Network Theory and tourism research'. *Tourist Studies*, 5(2): 133-150.

Jóhannesson, G.T. (2007) 'Emergent Vikings: The Social Ordering of Tourism Innovation'. *Event Management*, 14(4): 261-274.

Jóhannesson, G.T. (2012) '"To Get Things Done": A Relational Approach to Entrepreneurship'. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 12(2): 181-196.

Jóhannesson, G.T. and Bærenholdt, J.O. (2008) Enacting Places through the Connections of Tourism. *In* Bærenholdt, J.O. and Granås, B. (eds) *Mobility and Place: Enacting Northern European Peripheries*, pp. 155-166. Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Jóhannesson, G.T., Ren, C., van der Duim, R. and Munk, A. K. (2014) 'Actor network theory and tourism research: approaches, implications and future opportunities'. *In* Meged, J.W., Blichfeld, B. S., Hansen, L.A. and Hvass, K.A. (eds) *Tourism Methodologies*, pp.119-136. Copenhagen Business School Press.

Jóhannesson, G.T., Ren, C. and van der Duim, R. (eds) (2015) *Tourism Encounters and Controversies: Ongoing Politics of Tourism Development*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Larsen, J. (2005) 'Families seen photographing: the performativity of tourist photography'. *Space and Culture* 8(4): 416–434.

Lash, S. and Lury, C. (2007) *Global Culture Industry: the mediation of things*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Latour, B. (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Law, J. (2000) 'On the Subject of the Object: Narrative, Technology and Interpellation'. *Configurations*, 8(1): 1-29.

Law, J. (2004) *After method: Mess in social science research*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Law, J. (2009) 'Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics'. *In*: Turner, B.S. (ed) *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, pp.141- 158. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Law, J. and Urry, J. (2004) 'Enacting the Social'. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 390-410.

Law, J. and Singleton, V. (2005) 'Object lessons', *Organization*, 12(3): 331-355.

Law, J. and Singleton, V. (2013) 'ANT and politics: Working in and on the World', *Qualitative Sociology*, 36: 485-502.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.

Lincoln, Y.S., Lynham, S.A. and Guba, E.G. (2011) 'Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions and Emerging Confluences, Revisited'. *In* Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th edn), pp. 97-128. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.

Lury, C. (1997) 'The Objects of Travel'. *In* Rojek, C and Urry, J. (eds) *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, pp. 75-95. London: Routledge.

Marcus, G.E. (1995) 'Ethnography in/of the world system: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography' *Ann. Rev. Anthropol*, 24: 95-117.

Massey, D. (2003) 'Imagining the field'. *In* Pryke, M., Rose, G. and Whatmore, S. (eds) *Using Social Theory: Thinking Through Research,* pp. 71-88. London: Sage.

Maxwell, J.A. (2013) *Qualitative Research Design: an interactive approach* (3rd edn). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.

Mol, A. (1999) 'Ontological politics. A word and some questions'. *In* J. Law, J. and Hassard, J. (eds) *Actor network theory and after*, pp.74-89. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Mol, A. (2010) *Actor-Network Theory: sensitive terms and enduring tensions*. Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research. Available at http://dare.uva.nl/document/2/90295. Accessed 20 April 2015.

Murdoch, J. (1994). *Weaving the seamless web: a consideration of network analysis and its potential application to the study of the rural economy*. Centre for Rural Economy Working Paper Series, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, Working Paper 3. Available at http://ncl.ac.uk/cre/publish/pdfs/wp3a.pdf. Downloaded 30 January 2014.

Murdoch, J. (1998) 'The Spaces of Actor-Network Theory'. *Geoforum*, 29(4): 357-374.

Nhamo, G. (2010) 'Co-Leadership in Climate Change: an Agenda to 2013 and Beyond', *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies*, 36(3): 463-480.

Oppenheim, R. (2007) 'Actor-network theory and anthropology after science, technology and society'. *Anthropological Theory*, 7(4): 471-493.

Paget, E., Dimanche, F. and Mounet, J-P. (2010) 'A Tourism Innovation Case: an Actor-Network Approach'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3): 828-847.

Picken, F. (2010) 'Tourism, design and controversy: calling on non-humans to explain ourselves'. *Tourist Studies*, 10(3): 245-263.

Povilanskas, R. and Armaitiene, A. (2011) 'Seaside resort-hinterland Nexus: Palanga, Lithuania', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 38(3): 1156-1177.

Pryke, M., Rose, G. and Whatmore, S. (2003) (eds) *Using Social Theory: Thinking Through Research,* London: Sage.

Ren, C. (2010a). Assembling the socio-material destination: An actor-network approach to cultural tourism studies. *In* Richards G. and Munsters, W. (eds.), *Cultural Tourism Research Methods,* pp. 199–208. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publications.

Ren, C. (2010b) 'Beyond hosts and guests: translating the concept of cultural misconception'. *Int. J. of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(4): 287-298.

Ren, C. (2011) 'Nonhuman agency, radical ontology, and tourism realities'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3): 858-881.

Ren, C. and Blichfeldt, B.S. (2011) 'One Clear Image? Challenging Simplicity in Place Branding', *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 11(4): 416-434.

Ren, C., Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (2010) 'Constructing tourism research: a critical enquiry'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4): 885-905.

Ren, C. Jóhannesson, G.T. and van der Duim, R. (2012) 'How ANT works'. *In* van der Duim, R., Ren, C. and Jóhannesson, G.T. (eds) (2012) *Actor-Network Theory and Tourism,* pp. 13-25. Abingdon: Routledge.

Riles, A. (2000) *The Network Inside Out.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Robson, C. (2011) *Real World Research*, (3rd edn). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Rodger, K., Moore, S.A. and Newsome, D. (2009) 'Wildlife Tourism, Science and Actor-Network Theory', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(4): 645-666.

Routledge, P. (2008) 'Acting in the network: ANT and the politics of generating associations'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26: 199-217.

Scarles, C. (2010) 'As words fail, visuals ignite', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37 (4): 905-926.

Schwandt, T.A. (2007) 'Judging Interpretations'. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 114: 11-25.

Sparkes, A.C. (2000) 'Auto-ethnography and narratives of self: from interpretation to action'. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17(1): 21-43.

Strathern, M. (1996) 'Cutting the network'. *J. Royal Anthropological Institute*, 2(3), 517-35.

Tribe, J. (2004) 'Knowing about tourism: epistemological issues'. *In* Phillimore, J. and Goodson, L. (eds) *Qualitative Research in Tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, pp. 46-62London: Routledge.

Tribe, J. (2009) (ed) *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View.

Tribe, J. (2010) 'Tribes, Territories and Networks in the Tourism Academy'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(1): 7-33.

Van der Duim, R. (2007a) 'Tourismscapes: an actor-network perspective', *Annals of Tourism Research,* 34(4): 961-976.

Van der Duim, R. (2007b) Performing African Tourism. *In* Wishitemi, B., Spencely, A. and Wels, H. (eds) *Culture and Community: tourism studies in Eastern and Southern Africa,* pp. 25-48. Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers.

Van der Duim, R. and Caalders, J. (2008) 'Tourism chains and pro-poor tourism development: an actor-network analysis of a pilot project in Costa Rica'. *Current Issues in Tourism,* 11(2): 109-125.

Van der Duim, R., Peters, K. and Wearing, S. (2005) 'Planning Host and Guest Interactions: Moving beyond the empty meeting grounds in African encounters'. *Current Issues in Tourism,* 8(4): 286-305.

Van der Duim, R., Ren, C. and Jóhannesson, G.T. (eds) (2012) *Actor-Network Theory and Tourism: ordering, materiality and multiplicity.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Van der Duim, R., Ampumuza, C. and Ahebwa, W.M. (2014) 'Gorilla Tourism in Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda: an Actor-Network perspective'. *Society and Natural Resources: An International Journal,* 27(6): 588-601.

Verschoor, G. (1997) *Tacos, Tiendas and Mezcal: an actor-network perspective on small-scale entrepreneurial projects in Western Mexico.* Available at http://edepot.wur.nl/138383. Accessed 22 November 2013.

Walsh, N. and Tucker, H. (2009) 'Tourism 'things': The travelling performance of the backpack'. *Tourist Studies,* 9(3): 223-239.

Wearing, S. and McDonald, M. (2002) 'The Development of Community-based Tourism: Re-thinking the Relationship Between Tour Operators and Development Agents as Intermediaries in Rural and Isolated Area Communities'*, Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 10(3): 31-45.

Wearing, S., Wearing, M. and McDonald, M. (2010) 'Understanding local power and interactional processes in sustainable tourism: Exploring village-tour operator relations on the Kokoda track, Papua New Guinea', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 18(1): 61-76.

Westwood, S., Morgan, N. and Pritchard, A. (2006) 'Situation, Participation and Reflexivity in Tourism Research: Furthering interpretive approaches in tourism enquiry'. *Tourism Recreation Research,* 31(2): 33-41.

Whatmore, S. (2003) 'Generating materials'. *In* Pryke, M., Rose, G. and Whatmore, S. (2003) (eds) *Using Social Theory: Thinking Through Research,* pp. 89-104. London: Sage.

Yin, R.K (2013) *Case Study Research: design and methods* (5th edn). London: Sage.