Place and power in tourism development: tracing the complex articulations of community and locality

Raoul V. Bianchi [†]

Centre for Leisure and Tourism Studies (United Kingdom)

Abstract: This paper outlines the case for the analysis of tourism, power and place in the development process from a critical sociological perspective. It draws on recent trends in the sociology of development to develop existing theoretical models in a manner which transcends the more rigid dualisms between structure and agency on the one hand, and, the concerns of power and identity on the other. As in recent works from noted scholars such as Picard and Wood (1997), the relationship between tourism and processes of development and social transformation are more nuanced and varied than previous 'theoretical' models in tourism have recognised. Hence, this paper examines the issue by considering four major thematic areas of relevance to the study of tourism and its diverse relationships to processes of social change: the relations of community, consumption, production and place.

Keywords: Tourism; Power; Community; Consumption

Resumen: Este artículo esboza el caso del análisis del turismo, el poder y el espacio en los procesos de desarrollo desde la perspectiva de la sociología crítica. Se sirve de las recientes tendencias en la sociología del desarrollo por extender los modelos teóricos existentes de manera que trascienda el rígido dualismo entre estructura y organismo de un lado, y acerca del poder y la identidad, por otro. Tal como han admitido en recientes trabajos destacados investigadores como Picard y Wood (1997), la relación entre turismo y procesos de desarrollo y transformación social están más matizados y variados que los modelos 'teóricos' previos. Desde este punto de vista, este artículo examina el tema considerando cuatro áreas temáticas de especial relevancia para el estudio del turismo y sus diversas relaciones con los procesos de cambio social: la relaciones de comunidad, consumo, producción y espacio.

Palabras clave: Turismo; Poder; Comunidad; Consumo

[†] Stapleton House. University of North London. 277-281 Holloway Road. London. N7 8HN. E-mail: r.bianchi@londonmet.ac.uk

Introduction

A cursory glance at the literature on tourism development points to continuing tensions between a problem-solving pragmatism on the one hand, and the emergence of critical analyses on the other. A number of studies have tackled the critical analysis of tourism from a more structural and/or institutional perspective, including research on the commodification of place in post-industrial tourim (Britton 1991), the economic geography of tourism systems (Ioannides and Debbage 1998), and the politics of tourism policy and planning (Hall 1994; 2000a).

From an altogether different theoretical angle, there is a growing field of research that rejects the apparent essentialisms associated with the neo-colonialist model in tourism (see, for e.g. Britton 1982; Palmer 1994), and deals with a more nuanced analysis of the complex strategies of negotiation and engagement with capitalist modernity as manifest in tourism (Picard and Wood; Oakes 1998). Notions of 'hybridity' and 'diversity' are central to a number of other recent studies which embrace a post-colonial stance (hence the centrality of authors such as Foucault and Bhabha within their writings), whose concern it is to reveal the more composite nature of power relations (Cheong and Miller 2000), and strategies of cultural production within tourism (Hollinshead 1998, 1999).

While tourism development studies have had a tendency to give primacy to structure over agency, thus ignoring the creative engagement of local populations with different modalities of tourism development, others have emphasised the study of diversity, in isolation from the hierarchical structures of power which connect localities to the wider political economy. Theoretical shortcomings within the literature have already been noted elsewhere (for e.g. Allcock 1983; Nash 1996; Milne 1998), however, it is argued here that an emergent set of antagonisms can be discerned within the now more mature field of critical tourism studies. It is thus the intention of this paper to analyse a way forward for our understanding of tourism, power and place in the development process, that transcends the dualisms between normative preoccupations with difference and diversity on the one hand, and inequality and power on the other.

This brief review constitutes a platform upon which to argue for a more rigorous and nuanced consideration of tourism and social transformation, which considers the relations of consumption, production and transformation of space engendered by historically-specific dynamics of tourism development. It elucidates upon existing and potential critical research into processes of tourism development which examine the historical variations in the forms of capitalist development which condition the development of tourism, in conjunction with the political agency of the state. As already stated by Hall (1994: 13), nor can the complex articulations of power within tourism be effectively analysed through recourse to the apparently value-free approaches postulated by the pragmatic school of tourism planning and policymaking studies.

They are underpinned by a pluralist conception of power which challenges the possibility of revealing the systemic sources of inequality and range of antagonisms within tourism development processes by virtue of their implicit acceptance of the prevailing social order. An historical comparative approach to the study of tourism development that is sensitive to the different contexts of development offers an alternative paradigm of analysis which also calls into question the anti-essentialism of Foucauldain/post-colonial approaches to tourism, which arguably privilege the understanding of diversity at the expense of structural inequalities in the development process.

Tourism Resort Development: Community vs Commodity ?

During the 1960s and 1970s, at the time when the anthropology of tourism was beginning to emerge as a discrete area of study, the study of tourism's 'impact' upon host societies, served to consolidate the notion of the 'community' as an entity under threat from external forces of change. In the 1970s, as grassroots movements

began to find a voice in international policy forums, calls for local participation were sometimes reflected in concrete programmes supported by international aid agencies, such as the integrated village tourism project in the Lower Casamance region of Senegal (Saglio 1979).

Yet the emergence of the term 'community' in the tourism literature occurred at a time when its analytical usefulness was already beginning to be heavily questioned in the social sciences (Boissevain 1975), an issue to which I will return again below. More recently, the community has re-emerged as an object of social inquiry and mobilising ideology (e.g. Etzioni 1993) in response to the radical conservatism of the 1980s and its associated neo-liberal economic policies which have de-stabilised communities and led to the disintegration of the social fabric in Western industrialized societies (Hutton 1996). The attachment to 'community' as a territorially fixed notion, has received even greater impetus as the impacts of globalisation and rapid changes in communications technologies serves to further accentuate feelings of dislocation and up-rootedness (Lash and Urry 1994).

The relationship between community, place and power is relevant for the examination of tourism development, particularly with regard to the 'community-based' approaches to tourism planning and development (Murphy 1985; Haywood 1988; Brohman 1996) and the evaluation of residents' perceptions of tourism (Pearce et al. 1996). Since Murphy's (1985) well-known publication, there has been a proliferation of studies which share the basic proposition that the involvement of residents in decision-making is the key to sustainable tourism development and furthermore would engender increased acceptance and legitimacy of tourism as an economic development policy. A number of authors focused on an attempte to postulate 'normative' models of community planning in order to involve different 'stakeholders' in the decision-making process (Jamal and Getz 1995; Timothy 1998), or foster cooperation between different government agencies and the public and private sectors (Timothy 1998), whilst others have evaluate the effectiveness of collaborative decision-making

in the reduction of power imbalances between different stakeholders (Bramwell and Sharman 1999). "Resident-responsive tourism" has thus been viewed as a central mobilising concept around which governments could construct more equitable planning of tourism development and simultaneously overcome resistance to tourism within some segments of the community (Brent Ritchie 1993).

Nevertheless, patterns of participation and community involvement in tourism have been the focus of critical attention in recent years (see Milne 1998). For example, Taylor (1995) argued that community participation represents a highly romanticized view of communal responsiveness and cohesion, and furthermore, highlighted the contradiction inherent in Murphy's (1985) model, whereby local residents are invited to participate in the decision-making process whilst simultaneously being expected to become part of the product. Joppe (1997) notes that in contrast to traditional notions of 'community economic development', which are locally-driven and embrace areas such as the social economy, 'community tourism development' tends to be top-down and driven by governments. Both Hall (1994) and Joppe (1997) have pointed out that a major weakness of prescriptive community tourism planning models is due to the fact that they tend to be based on a pluralist conception of power, in which conflict is overt and power is distributed relatively evenly, and that furthermore, it is assumed that consensus can be achieved via the implementation of adequate deliberative mechanisms (eg. Simmons 1994).

Most, if not all, studies concerned with community involvement in tourism, recognise the complex and stratified nature of communities (eg. Ryan and Montgomery 1994), however, they still do not go far enough in terms of theorizing the nature of power, conflict, development and political agency in the context of tourism. Indeed, Hall (2000a: 33) argues that the community approach may offer little more than a useful starting point for the formulation of tourism policies. While there may be conceptual differences with regard to the notion of community participation in tourism, it still holds sway as a mobilising concept (Hall and Richards 2000).

Moreover it coalesces the current enthusiasm for notions such as 'social capital' within institutions promoting development assistance in areas such as the former Communist countries (Schuurman 2000: 18-19). Arguably, this reflects the North American bias in much of the literature, in so far as most of the case studies concern communities within the industrialised capitalist societies in which socioeconomic divisions between local residents, investors and state bureaucracies are perhaps not as significant as they are where tourism development in more peripheral and/or economically deprived regions is concerned.

Indeed, the notions of local governance and community-based decision-making expressed in such models, tend to reflect the experiences of capitalist development in all but a few of the world's industrial-capitalist 'democracies', whilst ignoring the particular circumstances in which capitalism and political institutions have emerged in other parts of the world. It is therefore relevant that we theorize the boundaries of place prior to an examination of how tourism shapes the economy, society and political structure of destination communities.

Conceptualising the Boundaries of Place

Giddens (1991) argues that sociology has been too preoccupied with bounded notions of society, when in fact the processes of modernization linked to the historical evolution of capitalism by their very nature serve to undermine national boundaries, a point famously noted early on by Marx and Engels in The Communist Manifesto. Indeed, static and bounded notions of community were clearly reflected in a number of field studies carried out in the Mediterranean during the 1950s and 1960s (Boissevain 1979: 82). In their attempt to delineate the values which served to create consensus and reproduce the boundaries of community, they attributed a universal set of values (principally, the 'honour' and 'shame' complex) across a variety of Mediterranean social systems which set them apart from other European societies (Goddard et al. 1996: 7).

By the 1970s onwards these accounts of Mediterranean social structure began to be criticised for their preoccupation with small-scale, face-to-face (predominantly rural) societies, viewed in isolation from wider social processes (Boissevain 1975; 1979; Davis 1977; Gilmore 1982). At a time when much of southern Europe was undergoing dramatic social, economic and political transformations, uprooting agrarian populations, fuelling urban growth and the intensification of linkages to global markets, not to mention the expansion of tourism, it was evident that the isolated 'community' study was more a reflection of the anthropological imagination than it was an accurate rendering of the socioeconomic reality of this region. In a particularly stinging attack, Llobera argues that part of this weakness stems from the fact that Mediterranean anthropology is the creation of the Anglo-Saxon anthropological imagination, underpinned by their monopoly of the "knowledge-product" (1986: 30).

In his recent critical exploration of the concept of 'society', Urry (2000:11) points out that the concept of society reflects a particular historical moment between 1700-1900 which witnessed the emergence of industrial capitalism in western Europe and North America, in which societies became synonymous with "a nation-state, with clear territorial and citizenship boundaries and a system of governance over its particular citizens". Increasingly, he argues, the emergence of manifold global flows and networks problematises the raw material of sociological inquiry, that is, the ontological status of society itself. Indeed, Wood's (2000) examination of the effects of economic restructuring in the global cruise line industry, demonstrates the growth of transnational capital and its capacity to distance itself from the constraints of geography and state power. The implications of this claim are significant, not only for sociological inquiry into the nature of tourism and how it interacts with particular communities, but for the inhabitants of different localities and the need to locate oneself in relation to the 'fixed' coordinates of 'community', as well as the policy-makers, who attempt to monitor, regulate and control the numerous networks and mobilities that contest immutable boundaries of, for example, the 'nation'.

With particular regard to the relation-

ship between tourism and local cultures, Picard claims that "tourism cannot be conceived of outside culture at all: it is bound up in an ongoing process of cultural invention" (1995: 47). The implications of this presupposition are clear; we need to construct a more nuanced understanding of the complex relations between tourism, cultures, capital and the state. The transformation of societies which become incorporated into circuits of tourism development have thus lead to the dissolution of clear and immutable boundaries between the very 'ethnicities' that they originally gave rise to, that is, the 'tourist' and the 'resident' (cf. Jafari 1984).

Arguably, this distinction has always been more imagined than real, and never as marked as it was suggested in some of the earlier literature on the impacts of tourism (e.g. Mathieson and Wall 1982). Nevertheless, as the forces of globalisation intensify, tourism destinations, much like 'world cities' (Sassen 1991), can perhaps be envisaged as a nexus, situated at the interface of a transnational web of flows in which tourists, workers, migrants, and residents intersect (King 1995). The growth of regional economic unions (e.g. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, EU, NAFTA), in order to facilitate the mobility of capital (and tourists) across political boundaries, is testament to the growing importance of transnational relations (see Hall 2000b). If the claims of Castells (1996) and Urry (2000) are to be believed then the question 'who are the locals'?, and 'to whom should strategies of community involvement respond?', are increasingly problematic in a world defined by transnational mobilities configured by networks rather than nations and communities with clearly delineated boundaries. Tourism thus both epitomises as well as reproduces the multi-layered mobilities which undermine mutually reinforcing hierarchies of territory, culture and the structures of power within the nation-state.

The identity of place can perhaps also be envisaged as a series of over-lapping "imagined worlds" or cultural landscapes which are experienced and constituted by human agency (Appadurai 1990). This is reflected in the work of Waldren (1996), who traces the shifting contours of insider/outside

identities in the touristic village of Deia in Mallorca. Here, the categories of host and guest, or rather, insider and outsider, are conceptualised in relation to the symbolic practices through which the different members of the village identify themselves in relation to each other, as well as distinct groups of outsiders. Her analysis reflects that of Harrison (1999), who deploys the concept of 'cultural boundaries' in order to examine the manner in which members of particular communities construct different representations of boundedness in opposition to either, the 'pollution' of putative notions of indigenous culture, or its 'appropriation' by outsiders.

Similarly, Fees (1996) demonstrates how the boundaries of local identity change over time, as different groups of residents seek to appropriate and regulate the means of authentification. Hollinshead (1998), is also a forceful exponent of the view that tourism exemplifies the discontinuous nature of boundaries between peoples, cultures and ethnic identities. In this respect, in so far as it is argued that tourism promotes the invention, reinvention and deinvention of difference, tourism highlights transitional spaces within cultural practices rather than transnational relations between classes.

Yet at the same time it is vital that we do not lose sight of the material economic and political circumstances which condition the struggle over the control of resources by the different interest groups brought together in the context of tourism development. Arguably, the work of anthropologists on the ground in a number of different contexts, has made a significant contribution to our understanding of the differentiated and uneven responses to tourism within specific localities (Boissevain 1996).

Culture rather than being seen as a static or organic entity, can be considered in terms of "a configuration of resources" which are appropriated, on the one hand, by political elites in order to reinforce a particular ideological construction of history/heritage - as evidenced in the Balkans (Allcock 1995), or alternatively, as a tool of resistance and appropriation of the forms of cultural representation sanctioned by state agency for tourism - as demonstrated by the complex tapestry of responses to tour-

ism in the collection of papers edited by Picard and Wood (1997).

Places are therefore not congruent with a specific geographical location, but are "constructed out of a particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together at a particular locus" (Massey 1991: 28). However, as Bauman (1998) and Stephenson (1997) remind us, the contours of global mobility are highly stratified. The liberating forces of globalisation for some (diplomats, business executives, and academics who are not persecuted by their domestic political regimes) are mirrored in the increasing constraints of space for the migrant worker, refugee and different non-White communities. Moreover the contours of global mobility are accentuated by the transnationalisation of capital, which has seen power become increasingly disconnected from obligations (Bauman 1998: 9). Broadly in accordance with this view, Castells (1996) offers a succinct definition of place as a space of lived experiences, in contrast to the "space of flows" which constitutes a seamless web of inter-connected spaces (international airports, hotels. executive lounges) and telecommunications networks:

A place is a locale whose form, function and meaning are self-contained within the boundaries of physical contiguity. (Castells 1996: 423)

However, the conception of place as a refuge from the de-stabilising and hegemonic forces of global capital, is in danger of reducing it to an "oppositional category" and which, moreover, misinterprets its contradictory and hybrid characteristics (Oakes 1998: 62). Indeed, Castells (1996) is in danger of doing just that, and moreover provides little analysis of the interconnections between the different "spaces" and indeed how the agency of geographically distant actors may be directly implicated in the transformation of place. This is not to discard entirely the influence of geography on the constitution of relatively place-bound communities, but rather that we must recognise that individual localitites are increasingly inter-connected at different geographical scales via "multiple external connections" (Wolf 1982: 387), not least due to the increasingly transnational organisation of the relations of production (Massey 1995: 66).

Thus, geographically dispersed social groups are bound together in asymmetrical relations of power via a series of different informational, cultural, economic and political flows and networks, defined by Massey as "power geometries" (1993). Where tourism development in a particular locality is concerned, the different actors involved will be endowed with unequal capacities to exploit the economic opportunities which present themselves, depending upon their ability to conceive, appropriate, regulate and control the means of tourist production.

Given that tourism embraces a number of heterogeneous process often characterised by a combination of different modes of production (cf. van der Werff 1980), a processual and non-bounded analysis of place is central to the examination of the material forces of economic change and political agency which underpin these social alignments, can provide a more nuanced insight into the relationship between tourism, power and socio-spatial transformations. In this respect it is important to consider some of the specific aspects of tourism as a commodity form, in particular the manner in which it appropriates people, places and pasts in the process of creating value.

Tourism Development and the Relations of Consumption

Harvey's assertion that industrialization, which once produced urban forms, is now being produced by them (cited in Soja 1989:76), is a process also reflected in the logic of touristification which appropriates urban, as well as natural and cultural forms, as objects of consumption sui generis. The production and consumption of tourism experiences appropriates space and transforms landscapes, cultures and economies in a manner which can be distinguished from agrarian, industrial and other modes of capitalist development. First of all, tourism does not derive its end 'product' through the extraction of raw materials from the earth in order to then be processed or manufactured (ie. land as the 'subject' of labour), or invest labour and capital in order to cultivate produce on the land (land as 'object' of labour).

Rather, the most characteristic feature of tourism is that it extends production into areas with no "intrinsic production potential" (Husbands 1981: 50); its raw materials thus embody distinctive and hybrid combinations of socio-cultural, natural and physical features (which more often than not bear the imprint of human intervention), and processes of societal development in the receiving society itself. Historical landscapes, natural and cultural monuments and people themselves become incorporated into the "tourist gaze" (Urry 1990), although the presence of capitalist commodity relations varies considerably within particular touristic landscapes.

Second, the consumption of the specific features of different touristic sites requires the movement of the tourist/consumer to the 'product' itself thereby converting space into the object of consumption rather than merely production (see Husbands 1981: 45). The landscape is altered for touristic purposes only in so far as the provision of built infrastructure for accommodation and ancillary facilities are required in order to facilitate the consumption of visual attractions or participation in recreational activities (eg. coastal tourism). The physical alteration or restructuring of space for the purpose of commoditizing touristic places tends to occur only in the case of contrived attractions (eg. theme parks) which have little or no organic relationship to the landscape in which they are situated (cf. Cohen 1994). In this respect tourism is not as physically constrained by geographic and environmental features of the landscape, beyond of course the importance of the climate, as for example agriculture would be. For this reason tourism is often found in more remote and inaccessible areas of outstanding natural beauty and/or cultural exoticism (as defined by the Eurocentric mindset). Although non-European cultures have also been fascinated by the 'exotic' (eg. 'pre-modern' cultures who inhabit the margins of Asian capitalism) or representations of a mythologised past, as for example demonstrated by the proliferation of folk museums in many parts of Asia (cf. Oakes 1998), the economic power of the Pacific Rim, for example, has not been accompanied by global cultural hegemony on the unprecedented scale achieved by the dominant Western powers (Said 1993).

Third, a significant component of tourism constitutes the social interaction of visitors and locals, and as such is dependent upon the hospitality of 'hosts', and its commercialisation, in order to create an enjoyable experience. Thus the training and expertise required by tourism varies according to specific socio-cultural contexts and degree of similarity of destination areas with the cultural characteristics of the tourists themselves (Burns 1993). Extending this logic further it becomes apparent that there is a further dimension to tourism production than with other forms of economic activity. Adapting Wright's (1993) distinction between 'exploitative economic oppression' (where exploiters need the exploited, principally for their labour-power) and 'non-exploitative economic oppression' (where exploiters do not require the labour or efforts of the exploited for their material well-being, but rather for their land) it becomes clear that tourism may give rise to a third category of exploitative relations, exploitative symbolic oppression. The self-exploitation of one's own culture ('being-themselves-for others') predominates where few economic alternatives prevail, as evidenced by the incorporation of Maasai warriors into an "economy of performance" for tourists in East Africa, de-politicizing the participants in the process (cf. Bruner 1995).

As in any predominantly capitalistic system of production, exploitative economic relations are prevalent (but not necessarily predominant) throughout the tourism productive system in the institutions of service provision (cf. Britton 1991). However what is significant and unique is the degree to which the material well-being of tourism often thrives upon the exploitation of living human communities and cultures for their image (MacCannell 1976, 1992). Where national ancestries and ethnic identities are on view for tourist consumption, the local inhabitants may provide an important component of the destination's image, as do for example the Sami peoples in northern Finland (Saarinen 1998). In this regard some tourists are interested in living communities not only for their recreational value, but as signs of themselves, thereby transforming people, places and

cultures into objects sui generis (Culler 1981: 127). Inhabitants may not even play a part in the provision of tourism services but may be coopted into the tourist gaze and "condemned to struggle endlessly to be just like its image, pure surface" (MacCannell 1992: 287).

Residents and workers of tourist destination areas are located at the interface between production and consumption and are therefore simultaneously producers or providers of services, as well as being woven into the consumerist fantasies and expectations of tourists (Britton 1991: 458). Uniquely, tourism serves to implode the rigid distinction between work and play by situating elements of the tourism workforce within a performative setting that embodies the cultural ambience of the tourism place-product that is consumed (Crang 1997). Yet the continuously shifting nature of cultural production within tourism also challenges the ability of the state and capital to localise and reify those who happen to be caught in the tourist gaze. This is demonstrated by the creative engagement of villagers in the province of Guizhou in China, with the discourses of tourism promoted by the state (in alliance with capital), in order to project alternative local identities through tourism (Oakes 1998). Although even Oakes (1997: 67) is forced to admit that the opportunities for fair economic compensation from tourism and participation in wider decision-making processes are more limited.

Yet the work of Selwyn (1996) and others (Lanfant et al. 1995, Picard and Wood 1997; Oakes 1998) demonstrate that the tapestry of resistance to the capitalist commodifiaction of culture in the context of tourism is far more complex than Britton (1991) and others suggests. For example, Oakes (1998: 10) argues, local villagers in the province of Guizhou (China), participate in "elaborate rituals of consumption" for tourists, as a means of confronting and negotiating the modernizing impulses of tourism which are 'imposed' by the state within the context of expanding commodity capitalist relations. Tourism thus expresses the manifold contradictions which are manifest in the processes of globalization which have intensified the interconnections between different parts of the globe, creating a context within which different versions of, or rather, paths to modernity or negotiated.

The fact that the commodification of cultures precipitated by tourism may be a disempowering experience in some circumstances should not overlook instances where marginal cultures have appropriated tourism as a political instrument in the constitution of their identity, as for example demonstrated by the Ainu in Japan (cf. Friedman 1990). Nevertheless, we should also be wary of slipping into the cultural relativism which celebrates difference at the expense of the analysis of the systemic inequalities which are reproduced in the context of tourism. There is thus perhaps an even stronger case than before, to develop a rigorous theoretical understanding of the systemic sources of economic, political and ideological power which continue to exclude and marginalise many people from the still unrealised potential of tourism as a force for development.

The Relations of Tourism Production

Few would disagree with the assertion that the examination of the factors which condition the emergence of tourism in a given locality needs to remain close to the empirical data yet be sensitive to wider structures of power (Selwyn 1996: 29). At times however it appears that postmodernist critiques of development thinking have contributed to a great deal of theoretical pessimism and a retreat into methodological individualism and middle-way descriptive-heuristic notions such as social capital and civil society (Schuurman 2000). Rather than reject any possibility of explanation which encompasses an holistic view of tourism, we must therefore pay greater attention to the role and position of the "specificities" [of] "localized formations" within "totalizing theorizations" (Makdisi et al. 1996: 10-11). One way forward perhaps, is to consider what Urry (1995: 69-73), paraphrasing Massey (1995), refers to as the contingent relations of capitalist production, that is, the manner in which the necessary or broader forces of capitalist development are manifest in locally and culturally distinct patterns of touristification.

Unsurprisingly, it has been commonly asserted that tourism development should be examined in relation to capitalist development as a whole, and not as a series of isolated transactions within the context of a specific community (Britton 1991; Hall 1994). However, some attempt needs to be made in order to link together our understanding of the larger-scale processes of tourism investment and development, with the different strategies of adaptation and response to tourism in a particular locality, whilst recognising the influence of structural and institutional constraints which set the conditions for the possible scope of social interaction dut do not determine its specific nature or for that matter, the outcome (cf Kiely 1995). Although contemporary forms of global tourism development are underscored by the dynamic of capital accumulation which drives the global economy in its broadest sense, it is important to reocognise that, "the fundamental relations of capitalism developed historically under very different conditions" across different social formations (Massey 1995: 16). Hence, it must be recognised that tourism is geographically differentiated according to the local distinctiveness of capitalist development, and that furthermore a capitalism-centred view of the world may ignore different configurations of tourism production which exist at different scales of analysis (Milne 1998: 41).

Processes of tourism development are thus challenged and appropriated at different levels of society by overlapping networks of social action, in which individuals and groups are guided by a variety of strategic orientations. Nevertheless, although actors may be able to exercise a degree of autonomy with regard to their responses to development processes, social agency occurs within structural circumstances which are not of their own making (Marx 1977: 173). It is conditioned by the unequal relationship to different modes of surplus appropriation and political domination within any given social formation, which cannot be reduced to the economic structure alone (cf. Mouzelis 1995: 16). In this regard it is possible to adopt a less reductionist interpretation of power relations:

the capacity of social agents, agencies and institutions to maintain and transform their environment, social or physical. It is about the resources that underpin this capacity and about the forces that shape and influence its exercise (Held 1994: 311).

To describe the social and economic changes associated with tourism development in terms of a linear progression through a sequence of development stages (Butler 1980), ignores the multiplicity of linkages and relations of interdependence which bind a particular locality to wider levels of society and productive activity, and which help shape local patterns of development (Massey 1993: 145). A more nuanced approach to analysis is needed in order to transcend the oppositional distinction between the local and the global in order to challenge the often top down determinations inherent within many analyses of tourism development (cf. Britton 1991). An examination of the distinctive processes of local adaptation and response to tourism, therefore needs to be understood in the context of a locality's historical connections to wider socio-economic contexts:

A society, even a village, has its own structure and history, and this must be as much part of the analysis as its relations with the larger context within which it operates. (Ortner 1984: 143)

The distinction between studies of a macro-structural nature and those, usually, anthopological investigations of micro-level responses to tourism raises an interesting conceptual issue regarding the relationship between tourism, place and power. This is particularly relevant with regard to the calls for empowering local communities as a means of realising the sustainable development of tourism development (cf. Hall and Richards 2000). There is still a tendency to fall back on residual definitions of 'community' in which the notions of scale and power are conflated, thus giving rise to a misleading distinction between macro-structures, equated with large-scale institutions (e.g. transnational corporations, international financial/political agencies) and micro-interactions, for example, routine encounters between tourists and residents.

If, however, societies are conceptualised as "hierarchized social wholes" in which institutional structures and interactions

can occur at different scales of analysis (see Mouzelis 1995: 24-27), a clearer picture can emerge regarding the relationships and struggles between different groups of collective actors to articulate and promote particular versions of tourism development at different levels. Thus, for example, face-to-face interactions can occur at macro-institutional levels (e.g. a meeting of finance/tourism ministers in the EU etc..), which have equally significant implications for the outcome of tourism development in a specific locality as do the wider ownership structures of transnational tourism enterprises (cf. Britton 1991).

A clear example of micro-interactions at a macro-level is demonstrated by the successful attempt by the president of the World Travel and Tourism Council, a powerful lobbying organisation for corporate tourism interests, to scrap proposals for an airline transportation tax at a 1997 meeting in the United Nations (Honey 1999: 33). Moreover, institutional structures or rules may emerge at a micro-level, as evidenced by the role of the Anafiot's Migrant Association in the promotion of tourism development on the Greek island of Anafi (Kenna 1993: 88-89), and in Michaud's (1997) discussion of the importance of local cultural norms in the regulation of entrepreneurial agency amongst different generations of Hmong hill tribes in Thailand.

The spatial distribution of tourism development and the social organisation of its production in a particular locality are thus the result of multiple determinations and flows of people, capital and cultures, which have historically transformed the nature and intensity of a locality's linkages to the wider political economy. There is a need therefore to move away from the often over-generalized nature of the political economy of tourism which often places tourism destinations at the mercy of transnational capital, as well as construct analyses which are sensitive to the specific features of local/regional/national of capitalist formations, in relation to the nature of the touristic modes of development which take root in particular areas. Until very recently, a neglected yet useful way of bridging the gap between macro and micro theorising in tourism, is through the examination of the social nature of tourism entrepreneurship.

Social Configurations of Tourism Entrepreneurship

Until recently, the investigation of the social composition and dynamics of the local entrepreneurial classes in the tourism development processes of specific localities, has received scant attention in the literature (Shaw and Williams 1998). Earlier diffusionist studies of tourism development alluded to the role of local entrepreneurs during the initial stages of tourism development (Noronha 1979; Butler 1980), or else viewed as comprador elites complict in the metropolitan exploitation of third world tourism destinations (Britton 1982). Yet de Kadt (1979: 47-49) drew attention to the fact that tourism may precipitate the emergence of a new entreprenerial middle-class, while over a decade before Nuñez (1963) noted that tourism paved the way for the "culturally marginal" members of poorer destination areas to exploit the commercial opportunities created by tourism. More recently, a number of anthropological studies have examined the ethnic, social and gender dimensions of entrepreneurioal startification in various different geograghical contexts (Din 1991; van den Berghe 1992; Michaud 1991, 1997; Galaní-Moutáfi 1993; Scott 1997).

A number of studies of tourism entrepreneurship and local economic development have also framed their analyses using the well known formal-informal sector model (Wahnschafft 1982; Kermath and Thomas). Most tend to agree that informal sector, or simply, small-scale enterprises (Rodenburg 1980) are better able to establish stronger linkages with local suppliers than larger (often foreign-owned) bureaucratic enterprises, and thus enable indigenous entrepreneurs to benefit more from tourism (Echtner 1995; Brohman 1996). However, in some cases, the informal-formal sector model may inhibit a more nuanced understanding of the manifold socioeconomic relationships which encompass both sectors (Dahles 1997). Furthermore, the linear conception of tourism entrepreneurship, as depicted in the work of Oppermann (1993), who argues that the tourism informal sector performs a 'discovery function', may be correct to suggest that the initial flourishing of tourism en-

terprise is 'organic' (Cohen 1979), but neglects to consider the substantive nature of power relations which gives rise to uneven ethnic, social and gender configurations of entrepreneurship. Moreover, the dynamics of local entrepreneurship are not considered in relation to the hierarchical nature of social relations, and the ability of particular groups of entrepreneurs to concieve of and effect change at different sociogeographic scales of interaction.

Britton (1987) has also argued that scale and ownership are meaningless terms in the absence of a theoretical framework of analysis. Thus he argues that, ownership is more than a juridical category but rather it should be considered as "an economic relation to the means of organization of an enterprise and the distribution-appropriation of surplus generated by the enterprise" (1987: 183). Tourism enterprises which are similar in size and type, may vary significantly according to local cultural norms, the organization of work and what Massey refers to as their, "orientation to production and investment opportunities" (1995: 27). This therefore has important implications for our understanding of how patterns of entrepreneurship are linked to the distribution of power in a specific locality. Moreover there are significant degrees of differentiation within what are nominally referred to as 'family' or informal sector enterprises, a factor ignored by many studies of local level tourism development. In this respect the weakness of dualist analyses of the formal and informal sector lies in the fact that it categorises family-run firms entirely within the informal sector. Family enterprises may range from single bars or restaurants to larger-scale units of production characterised by a greater degree of linkages to distinct types of capital (equity, credit, public subsidies etc.), and sources of accumulation (eg. property speculation).

The shortcomings of Marxist analyses of the articulation between different modes of production, have also been highlighted (Long and Richardson 1978). Although these approaches offer a richer explanation of the complex relationships between different forms of production in the context of dependent capitalism, the Marxist perspective fails to adequately examine the degree of internal differentiation within non-capitalist modes of production, and the degree to which these processes serve to reproduce household economies (Long and Richardson 1978: 186-189). Indeed both approaches tend to obscure the internal variations within non-capitalist or non-formal sectors of the economy, and more significantly fail to conceptualise the nature of the inter-relationships which cut across these dualist categories. A particular household cannot be considered as a uniform socio-economic entity, and indeed there may be a variety of strategies of subsistence and accumulation which intersect within any one particular household, thus tying its occupants into a diverse web of social relations at different levels of activity (Bianchi 1999). Goffee and Scase (1983) have attempted to develop a conceptual framework for the examination of the entrepreneurial middle-classes in the service sector, which transcends the shortcomings of both dualist and/or reductionist Marxist analyses. In their examination of the entrepreneurial middle-class in the service sector in Britain they differentiate four sub-categories of entrepreneurs according to the relative mix of capital and labour employed in a range of enterprises: self-employed; small entrepreneurs; owner-controllers; owner-directors. Indeed, their argument demonstrates that the entrepreneurial middle-class is situated in a series of "contradictory class locations" (cf. Wright 1993), in so far as they exercise varying degrees of control over the accumulation process and the work force, which has significant implications for their social mobility.

An investigation of the dynamics of tourism development must therefore consider the nature and scope of entrepreneurial agency at different levels of social interaction within the context of the local economy (micro/meso/macro). Thus the asymmetrical relations of power which condition entrepreneurial agency is not only linked to the ability to mobilise economic and political resources, but also to the social nature of entrepreneurship which mediates the normative expectations and interests which prevail in a given geographical and historical context:

If production is a social process, then the

social nature of capital is of fundamental importance when it comes to characterising a particular company. Descriptions based on apparently objective (because quantitative or formal) measures may completely miss all the important differences. (Massey 1995: 27)

Deeper conceptual and theoretical insight into the range of local responses to tourism needs to be conceptualised in relation to wider historical forces of social change, as well as the internal differentiation within non-capitalist sectors of the local tourist economy. Important factors to consider therefore include: the social composition of the entrepreneurial classes, the organisation and structure of enterprises, labour relations, the nature and scope of linkages to wider domains (mediated by political allegiances, investment patterns, cultural-educational capital), the degree of integration/concentration of tourism capital and perhaps most important of all, the social nature of entrepreneurial agency which inter-pellates those class fractions nominally at the same point in the overall social relations of production.

Social Relations and Tourism Spaces

Tourism development often gives rise to geographical distribution of production which reflects and reproduces a lack of alternative economic strategies. For example, whilst the lack of an industrial base and raw materials led to many island economies embracing tourism as a tool of development (Wilkinson 1989), the very process of transferring land, labour and capital into the service sector has further consolidated the dependence of these regions on tourism, thus making it even more difficult to diversify into other higher value-added areas of economic development.

Although comparative advantage in terms of cheap and productive labour is not as significant for the location of touristic enterprises in a particular locality as it is for manufacturing industries (Rodríguez and Portales 1994), it would be simplistic to assume that the emergence of tourism is reliant merely on the specificity of a location's unique environmental and cultural features. This approach reduces geography

to a passive space over which touristic activities are distributed according to each region's locational attractiveness, in which regions specialize in their "supply-side comparative advantage in tourism" (Bond and Ladman 1980: 232).

A similar physical determinism is demonstrated in Opperman's (1993) model of 'tourist space' in developing countries, which elaborates on the spatial diffusion of formal and informal sector activities in a social and political vacuum.

Such models merely describe the consequences of the social, economic and political processes which actively construct different tourism spaces, at the expense of examining the societal structures in which they are rooted. They therefore neglect to consider the distinctive adaptive capacities and conceptions of space of the different interest groups incorporated into the developmental impulses precipitated by tourism. Hence, the manner in which the owners of a local or family-run tourist enterprise in a particular locality relate to landscape or built environment within a tourism destination, may contrast with more powerful cliques of investors who are more integrated into wider structures of power and capital, and whose interests lie almost exclusively in the exploitation of the commercial touristic potential of the locality. Such contrasts are highlighted by Peck and Lepie (1989: 214), who describe how commercial and social conceptions of beachfront land became the subject of conflict between vacation home owners and resident islanders in a North Carolina coastal town.

Faced with competition over scarce resources, different groups within particular localities may unite in opposition to powerful interests, which may include locals as well. Thus it is also important to examine the factors which structure and condition intra-community competition over resources in relation to the hierchical nature of social relations so that the analysis does not retreat into a residual 'localism'. Powerful local actors and entrepreneurial coalitions may be able to exercise influence over planning and investment decisions at meso or even macro levels, which will have concrete implications for the appropriation of community resources (cf. Molotch 1976: 311-312).

Residents or investors who are dispro-portionately endowed with land-based assets that begin to accrue monetary value within the symbolic economy o tourism, may lobby local government more aggressively for mobile state capital as well as social overhead capital (e.g. access roads, pavements etc.) which will enable them to exploit this capital more effectively. This was evidenced in the town of Rethemnos in Crete, where proposals for the promotion of architectural heritage in the Old Town, precipitated moves by the absentee land-lord class to capitalise on the commercial potential of its symbolic-cultural assets (Herzfeld 1991, cited in Oakes 1998: 74-77). However their commercial interests may not only conflict (or compete) with the commercial interests of other local entre-preneurs whose economic and political capital is less significant at these levels, but it may also lead to decisions which transform the spatial patterns of develop-ment thereby affecting long-standing socio-cultural practices related to the civic use of space. This may occur via the sale of beachfront property to private developers thus restricting community access (Peck and Lepie 1989), or the conversion of his-torically symbolic buildings or gathering places into commercial use (Cockburn and Orbasli 1997), by governments or coalitions of private interests, who often attempt to exploit historic resources in a different manner (Odermatt 1996).

The geographical diffusion of tourism thus bears the imprint of complex and hi-erarchical relations of production and con-sumption. Thus it is also relevant to con-sider manner in which social and economic processes both reflect and reproduce the geographical configurations of touristic space and the varied modalities of human agency within it. Space, as Lefebvre (1976) reminds us, "has been shaped and moulded from historical and natural elements, but this has been a political process. It also bears the imprint of different social prac-tices and distinctive conceptions of time, particularly where the temporal tourist economy comes into contact with the the everyday lived spaces of the local resident communities. It is a product literally filled with ideologies" (cited in Soja 1989: 80). This does not merely refer to the fact that it

is an arena in which political conflict takes place, but rather that space mediates the different forms of social interaction which occurs within it (Massey 1995: 50-51). Hence, the spatial configuration of tourism destination areas should be viewed in the context of the uneven geographical distri-bution of the relations of production and the struggle to control or gain access to land, territory and resources (cf. Lanfant 1995: 6). The link between configurations of space and social interaction becomes ap-parent in the contrasting traditions of ur-banism in northern and southern Europe, in which civic life flourished in the densely-built urban cores of Mediterranean cities in contrast to the more segregated (post)industrial cities of northern Europe (cf. Leontidou 1998). Moreover, the strong linkages between tourism and land specu-lation in southern Europe reflects and re-produces the distinctive features of the uneven development of capitalism (and social structures) under which regional bourgeoisies accumulated wealth without production (Sapelli 1995: 67).

In his analysis of the emergence of the Saariselkä tourism in region in Finnish Lapland, Saarinen (1998) illustrates the manner in which tourism landscapes reflect the spatialization of historically-constructed representations through which hegemonic discourses define the identity of a tourism destination. In this case he dem-onstrates how the historical agency of the Finnish state, external capital and patterns of consumption have institutionalized a specific discourse of region which has mar-ginalized local Sami culture in the process of converting the landscape into an aes-theticized 'wilderness'. It is therefore im-portant to conceptualise the transforma-tion of place into destinations in accordance with the manner in which different social social groups and classes (e.g. neighbour-hood coalitions, social classes, ethnic groups, political alliances, different fac-tions of capitalist investors), ascribe value and meaning to the landscape in the con-text of development. Thus, the construc-tion of heritage has a socio-spatial as well as an ideological dimension, as demon-strated by the ideological battles embedded within the reconstruction of tourist sites and the borders of the 'nation' itself, in the

Balkans (Allcock 1995).

The declaration and promotion of World Heritage Sites is a particular case in point, whereby local attachment to historical places, monuments and landscapes may come into conflict with the policy goals of national and international conservationist institutions as well as the consumerist activities of tourists (e.g. Evans 1999).

There are also parallels between processes of gentrification, urban renewal and tourism, which may not only emerge from a similar combination of socio-economic forces, but are often closely linked processes in the context of urban regeneration projects and attempts to 're-image' cities for tourism (Beauregard 1986). The development and promotion of new inner city urban leisure and tourism spaces became seen as one of the principal mechanisms of socioeconomic regeneration in run-down inner-city areas in large Western cities. However, these processes must also be understood in the context of the globalisation of capital and the neo-liberal restructuring of the state, which arguably, has led to intensified territorial competition between cities, regions and states for investment capital (Britton 1991; Hall 1994: 155-167).

Not only have hotels, marinas and other leisure-related properties become distinct segments of the property market, but the increasing significance of symbolic and cultural capital in relation to the valorization of space, has converted 'places' into commodity forms in their own right (Britton 1991; Zukin 1995). However, the state also plays an important role in determining the precise nature and scope of private intervention in tourism (Wood 1984: 363). The urban reconfiguration of Singapore's historic China Town district reflects the disproportionate ability of a powerful centralised state, in alliance with capital, to regulate and define an ethnic and cultural landscape for tourism, in which local citizens are relatively disempowered (Leong 1997). Less powerful entrepreneurs, workers and residents who disproportionately consume the use values of space in which tourism exerts its presence, are thus less able to appropriate space in their own interests, and are only able to react to changes in the dominant mode of production and adapt their strategies of economic

survival accordingly (Harvey 1982).

The spatial configurations of tourism thus embody the intense competition over both the meanings and values of space which are conditioned by the prevailing modes of accumulation and structures of power. In order to develop a better understanding of the (re)configuration of space in tourism, it is necessary to consider the dialectical relationship between the hierarchically organised social actors and their differential conceptions of space witihin the context of tourism and development processes.

Prospects for a Sociology of Tourism Development

This brief review has sought to elucidate upon the some of the emergent fields of tourism development research and to suggest a conceptual framework for a more nuanced analysis of the different levels of agency which condition the dynamics of tourism development within specific historical and geographical contexts. It is argued that the ability of the different interest groups and collective actors to control and influence the outcomes of tourism development nneds to be examined in relation to their location within the hierachical structure of social relations through which they articulate with wider social systems. Drawing on Mouzelis's (1995) conceptualization of hierarchized social wholes, it is argued that tourism development processes can be viewed in the context of the manifold linkages which connect different actors to different types of capital, forms of governance and strategic orientations at different institutional levels.

One such application is in the growing field of research dealing with the social configurations of tourism entrepreneurship, which considers the differential capacities of distinct groups of entrepreneurs to mobilise cultural, economic and political capital in the pursuit of their interests.

Moreover, it has been shown that specific that tourism destination areas can be conceptualised as spaces of production and consumption, in which different interest groups contest the appropriation and use of space, in accordance with arange of distinctive values and interests. Tourism

spaces, therefore, reflect the contest over the meaning and 'appropriate' use to which particular places should be devoted, giving rise to distinctive structures of production and patterns of consumption in different localities. These are institutionalized at the different levels in accordance with the uneven spatial diffusion of capital and strategic orientations of state agency, which seek to define the 'authenticity' of particular touristic locales. Yet these are not immutable structures imposed from above but are contested and shaped by social actors situated in a complex hierarchy of articulations which shape peoples' capacity to intervene in their environments. Notwithstanding the considerable expansion in the scope of market relations on a global scale, tourism is embedded within diverse capitalist formations and shaped by a variety of state agency, ranging from the market-oriented state of the Anglo-American variety to the more interventionist approach of several continental European governments and East Asia.

Thus, the sociology of tourism development needs to once again situate itself at the heart of current debates regarding the nature of power, processes of globalisation and the configuration of communities and new economic spaces in tourism. There have been many important insights gained from the many contributions to the analysis of tourism development, and they should not be discarded lightly. However, the primacy of neo-liberal ideological relations in the current world order and a tendency towards a sense of pessimism with regard to the possibilities for change, challenge us to think about tourism in ways that transcend the existing order of things, but which are also sensitive to context and history.

References

Allcock, J. B.
1993 "The development of tourism in Yugoslavia: some conceptual and empirical lessons". In I. Dobozi & P. Mándi (Eds.) *Emerging Development Patterns: European Contributions. Selected papers of the 3rd Confence of EADI*, Budapest, Hungary, November 11-14 1981.

Allcock, J. B.
1995 "International tourism and the appropriation of history in the Balkans". In M. F. Lanfant et al. (Eds.) *International Tourism: Identity and Change* (pp. 100-112). London: Sage.

Appadurai, A.
1990 "Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy". In M. Featherstone (Ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage.

Bauman, Z.
1998 *Globalization: the Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beauregard, R.
1986 "The chaos and complexity of gentrification". In N. Smith & P. Williams (Eds.) *Gentrification of the City* (pp. 35-55). London: Unwin Hyman.

Bianchi, R. V.
1999 *A Critical Ethnography of Tourism Entrepreneurship and Social Change in a Fishing Community in Gran Canaria*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of North London.

Boissevain, J.
1975 "Towards a social anthropology of Europe". In J. Boissevain, & and J. Friedl (Eds.) *Beyond the Community: Social Process in Europe* (pp.9-17) The Netherlands: University of Amsterdam, European-Mediterranean Study Group.

1979 "Towards a social anthropology of the Mediterranean". *Current Anthropology*, 20(1): 81-93.

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

Bond, M. E. & Ladman, J. R.
1980 "International tourism: an instrument for Third World development". In I. Vogeler & A. de Souza (Eds.) *Dialectics of Third World Development* (pp. 231-40). New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun & Co.

Bramwell, B.& Sharman, A.
1999 "Collaboration in local tourism policy-making". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2): 392-415.

Brent Ritchie, J. R.

1993 "Crafting a destination vision - putting the concept of resident-responsive tourism into practice". *Tourism Management*, 14(5): 379-389.

Britton, S. G.

1982 "The political economy of tourism in the Third World". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(3): 331-358.

1987 "Tourism in small developing countries: development issues and research needs". In S. G. Britton & W. C. Clarke (Eds.) *Ambiguous Alternatives: Tourism in Small Developing Countries* (pp. 167-93). Suva: University of the South Pacific.

1991 "Tourism, capital and place: towards a critical geography of tourism". *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 9(4): 451-478.

Brohman, J.

1996 "New directions in tourism for Third World development". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(1): 48-70.

Bruner, E. M.

1995 "Maasai on the lawn: tourist realism in East Africa".*Cultural Anthropology*, 9(4): 435-470.

Burns, P.

1993 "Sustaining tourism employment". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(2): 81-96.

Butler, R. W.

1980 "The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources". *Canadian Geographer*, 24 (1): 5-12.

Castells, M.

1996 *The Rise of the Network Society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Cheong, So-Min and M. L. Miller

2000 "Power and tourism: A Foucauldian observation". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2): 371-390.

Cockburn, C. & A. Orbasli

1997 "Marketing historic towns: a western approach to urban conservation for tourism". In C. Fsadni & T. Selwyn (Eds.) *Sustainable Tourism in Mediterranean Islands and Small Cities* (pp. 60-73). Malta and London:

Medcampus.

Cohen, E.

1979 "Rethinking the sociology of tourism". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1): 18-35.

1994 "Contemporary tourism-trends and challenges: sustainable authenticity or contrived post-modernity?" In R. W. Butler & D. Pearce (Eds.) *Change in Tourism: People, Places, Processes* (pp.12-29). London: Routledge.

Crang, P.

1997 "Performing the tourist product". In C. Rojek & J. Urry (Eds.) *Tourism Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory* (pp. 137-154). London: Routledge.

Culler, J.

1981 "Semiotics of tourism". *American Journal of Semiotics*, 1(1/2): 127-140.

Dahles, H.

1997 "Tourism, petty entrepreneurs and sustainable development". In H. Dahles (Ed.) *Tourism, Small Entrepreneurs and Sustainable Development: Cases from Developing Countries* (pp.23-33) ATLAS/Tilburg University.

Davis, J.

1977 *People of the Mediterranean: an Essay in Comparative Social Anthropology.* London: Routledge.

De Kadt, E. (Ed.)

1979 *Tourism: Passport to Development?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Din, K.

1991 "The concept of local involvement and its application to Malaysian island resorts". ASEASUK Conference on Tourist Development in South-East Asia. University of Hull, Centre for South-East Asian Studies, March 25-28.

Echtner, C.

1995 "Entrepreneurial training in less developed countries". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1): 119-134.

Etzioni, A.

1993 The Spirit of Community. New York: Crown.

Evans, G.

1999 "Heritage tourism: development and diversity?" ICOMOS 12th World Congress of Conservation and Heritage, The Wise Use of Heritage, Oaxaca, Mexico, October.

Fees, C.

1996 "Tourism and the politics of authenticity in a North Cotswold town". In T. Selwyn (Ed.) *The Tourist Image* (pp. 121-146). Chichester: John Wiley.

Friedman, J.

1990 "Being in the world: globalization and localization". In M. Featherstone (Ed.) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity* (pp. 311-328) London: Sage.

Galaní-Moutafí, V.

1993 "From agriculture to tourism: property, labor, gender and kinship in a Greek island village (Part One)". *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 11: 241-270.

Giddens, A.

1991 *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goddard, V. A.; Llobera, J. R. & Shore, C. (Eds.)

1996 *The Anthropology of Europe: Identities and Boundaries in Conflict*. Oxford: Berg.

Goffee, R. & Scase, R.

1983 "Class, entrepreneurship and the service sector: towards a conceptual clarification". *Service Industries Journal*, 3(2): 146-160.

Gilmore, D.

1982 "Anthropology of the Mediterranean area". *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 11: 175-205.

Hall, C. M.

1994 *Tourism and Politics: Policy, Power and Place*. Chichester: John Wiley

2000[a] *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

2000[b] "Territorial economic integration and globalisation", Paper presented to the 7th ATLAS Conference, North-South: Contrasts and Connections in Global Tourism, 17-21st June, Savonlinna, Finland.

Hall, D. & Richards, G.

2000 "The community: a sustainable concept in tourism development?" In D. Hall & G. Richards (Eds.) *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development* (pp. 1-13). London: Routledge.

Harrison, S.

1999 "Cultural boundaries". *Anthropology Today*, 15(5): 10-13

Harvey, D.

1982 "Labour, capital and class struggle around the built environment in advanced capitalist societies". In A. Giddens & D. Held (Eds.) *Classes, Power and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates* (pp. 545-561). London: Macmillan.

Haywood, K. M.

1988 "Responsible and responsive tourism planning in the community". *Tourism Management*, 9(2): 105-118.

Held, D.

1994 "What should democracy mean today?" In *The Polity Reader in Social Theory* (pp. 304-312). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hollinshead, K.

1998 "Tourism and the restless peoples: a dialectical inspection of Bhabha's halfway populations". *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 1: 49-77.

1999 "Surveillance of the worlds of tourism: Foucault and the eye-of-power", *Tourism Management*, 20: 7-23.

Honey, M.

1999 *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?* Washington DC: Island Press.

Husbands, W.

1981 "Centres, peripheries, tourism and socio-spatial development". *Ontario Geography*, 17: 37-59.

Hutton, W.

1996 *The State We're In*. London: Vintage Press.

Ioannides, D. and Debbage, K. G.

1998 "Neo-Fordism and flexible specialization in the travel industry: dissecting the polyglot". In D. Ioannides and K. G. Debbage (Eds.) *The Economic Geography of the*

Tourist Industry. London: Routledge.

Jafari, J.
1984 "Unbounded ethnicity: the tourist network and its satellites". *Revue de Tourisme*, 3: 4-21.

Jamal, T. B. and Getz, D.
1995 "Collaboration theory and community tourism planning". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1): 186-204.

Joppe, M.
1996 "Sustainable community tourism development revisited". *Tourism Management*, 17(7): 475-479.

Kenna, M.
1993 "Return migrants and tourism development: An example from the Cyclades". *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 11: 75-95.

Kiely, R.
1995 *Sociology and Development: the Impasse and Beyond*. London: UCL Press.

King, R.
1995 "Tourism, labour and international migration". In A. Montanari & A. M. Williams (Eds.) *European Tourism: Regions, Spaces and Restructuring* (pp. 177-190). Chichester: Wiley.

Lanfant, M. F.; Allcock, J. & Bruner, E. M. (Eds.)
1995 *International Tourism: Identity and Change*. London: Sage.

Lash, S. & Urry, J.
1994 *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Leong, L. Wai-Teng
1997 "Culture and the State and ethnic tourism in Singapore". In M. Picard & R. E. W ood (Eds.) *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Leontidou, L.
1998 "On linkages between urbanism and urban restructuring in Mediterranean Europe". In C. Keyder (Ed.) *Tradition in Modernity: Southern Europe in Question* (pp.85-100). ISA Pre-Congress Volumes. XIVth World Congress of Sociology, Montreal.

Llobera, J.
1986 "Fieldwork in southwest Europe: Anthropological panacea or epistemological straightjacket?" *Critique of Anthropology*, 6(2): 25-33.

Long, N. and Richardson, P.
1978 "Informal sector, petty commodity production, and the social relations of small-scale enterprise". In J. Clammer (Ed.) *The New Economic Anthropology* (pp. 176-209). New York: St. Martin's Press.

MacCannell, D.
1976 *The Tourist: a New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books.
1992 *Empty Meeting Grounds: the Tourist Papers*. London: Routledge.

Makdisi, S.; Casarino, C. & Kart, R. E. (Eds.)
1996 *Marxism beyond Marxism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Marx, K.
1977 *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. D. McLellan (Ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Massey, D.
1991 "A global sense of place". *Marxism Today*, June: 24-29.
1993 "Questions of locality". *Geography*, 78(2): 142-149.
1995 *Spatial Divisions of Labour*. 2nd Edition. London: Macmillan.

Mathieson, A. and G. Wall
1982 *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*. Harlow: Longman.

Michaud, J.
1991 "A social anthropology of tourism in Ladakh (India)", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(4): 605-621.
1997 "A portrait of cultural resistance: the confinement of tourism in a Hmong village in Thailand". In Picard, M. & R.E. Wood (Eds.) *Tourism Ethnicity and the State* (pp. 128-154). Honolulu: University of Hawai Press.

Milne, S.
1998 "Tourism and sustainable development: the global-local nexus". In C. M. Hall & A. Lew (Eds.) *Sustainable Tourism: a Geographical Perspective* (pp. 35-48). Harlow: Longman.

Molotch, H.
1976 "The city as growth machine: toward a political economy of place". *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(2): 309-32.

Mouzelis, N. P.
1989 "Restructuring structuration theory". *Sociological Review*, 37(4): 613-635

1995 *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong? Diagnosis and Remedies.* London: Routledge.

Murphy, P.
1985 *Tourism: a Community Approach.* London: Routledge.

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

Oakes, T.
1997 "Ethnic tourism in rural Guizhou: Sense of place and the commerce of authenticity". In M. Picard and R. E. Wood (Eds.) *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies.* (pp. 35-70). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
1998 *Tourism and Modernity in China.* London: Routledge.

Odermatt, P.
1996 "A case of neglect ? the politics of (re)presentation: a Sardinian case". In J. Boissevain (Ed.) *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism* (pp. 84-111). Oxford: Berghahn.

Oppermann, M.
1993 "Tourism space in developing countries". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(3): 535-556.

Ortner, S.
1984 "Theory in anthropology since the sixties". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 26(1): 126-166.

Palmer, C.
1994 "Tourism and colonialism: The experience of the Bahamas", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4): 792-811.

Pearce, P., Moscardo, G. & Ross, G. F.
1996 *Tourism Community Relationships.* London: Pergamon.

Peck, J. G. & Lepie, A. S.
1989 "Tourism and development in three North Carolina coastal towns". In V. L. Smith (Ed.) *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (pp. 203-222). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Picard. M.
1995 "Cultural heritage and tourist capital: cultural tourism in Bali". In M. F. Lanfant et al. (Eds.) *International Tourism: Identity and Change* (pp. 44-83). London: Sage.

Picard, M. and Wood, R. E. (Eds.)
1997 *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Rodenburg, E. F.
1980 "The effect of scale in economic development: tourism in Bali". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7(2): 177-196.

Rodríguez, M. & Portales, J.
1994 "Tourism and NAFTA". *Tourism Management*, 15(5): 319-322.

Ryan, C. and Montgomery, D.
1994 "The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism and issues in community responsive tourism". *Tourism Management*, 15(5): 358-369.

Saarinen, J.
1998 "The social construction of tourist destinations: the process of transformation of the Saariselkä tourism region in Finnish Lapland". In G. Ringer (Ed.) *Destinations: Cultural landscapes of Tourism.* (pp.154-173). London: Routledge.

Saglio, C.
1979 "Tourism for discovery: a project in Lower Casamance, Senegal". In E. de Kadt (Ed.) *Tourism: Passport to Development?* (pp. 321-338) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Said, E.
1993 *Culture and Imperialism.* London: Chatto & Windus.

Sapelli, G.
1995 *Southern Europe Since 1945: Tradition and Modernity in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece and Turkey.* London: Longman.

Sassen, S.
1991 *The Global City.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Schuurman, F. J.
2000 "Paradigms lost, paradigms regained? development studies in the twenty-first century". *Third World Quarterly*, 21(1): 7-20.

Scott, J.
1997 "Chances and choices: women and tourism in northern Cyprus". In M. T. Sinclair (Ed.) *Gender, Work and Tourism* (pp. 66-90). London: Routledge.

Selwyn, T.
1996 "Introduction". In T. Selwyn (Ed.) *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth-making Tourism*. (pp. 1-32) Cichester: John Wiley.

Shaw, G. & Williams, A. M.
1998 "Entrepreneurship, small business culture and tourism development". In D. Ioannides & K. Debbage (Eds.) *The Economic Geography of the Tourist Industry* (pp. 235-255). London: Routledge.

Simmons, D.
1994 "Community participation in tourism planning". *Tourism Management*, 15(2): 98-108.

Soja, E.
1989 *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.

Stephenson, M.
1997 *Tourism, Race and Ethnicity: The Perception of Manchester's Afro-Caribbean Community Concerning Tourism, Access and Participation.* Unpublished Ph.D. Manchester Metropolitan University.

Taylor, G.
1995 "The community approach: does it work?" *Tourism Management*, 16(7): 487-489.

Timothy, D. J.
1998 "Cooperative tourism planning in a developing destination". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 6(1): 52-68.
1999 "Participatory planning: a view of tourism in Indonesia". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2): 371-391.

Urry, J.
1990 *The Tourist Gaze.* London: Sage.
1995 *Consuming Places.* London: Routledge.
2000 *Sociology Beyond Societies.* London: Routledge.

Van den Berghe, P.L.
1992 "Tourism and the ethnic division of labour". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(2): 234-249.

Van der Werff, P. E.
1980 "Polarizing implications of the Pescaia tourist industry". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7(2): 197-223.

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

Wilkinson, P. F.
1989 "Strategies for island micro-states". *Annals of Tourism Research*. 16(2): 153-177.

Wilson, D.
1993 "Time and tides in the anthropology of tourism". In M. Hitchcock, King, V. T. & M. Parnwell (Eds.) *Tourism in South-East Asia* (pp. 32-47). London: Routledge.

Wolf, E.
1982 *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wood, R. E.
1984 "Ethnic tourism, the state and cultural change in South-East Asia". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11: 333-374.

Wood, R. E.
2000 "Caribbean cruise tourism: globalization at sea". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2): 345-370.

Wright, E. O.
1993 "Class analysis, history and emancipation". *New Left Review*, 202 (November-December): 15-36.

Zukin, S.
1995 *Cultures of Cities*. London: Blackwell.