

## **Introduction**

Nelson H. H. Graburn

This collection of nine papers was written between 1974 and 1984 by undergraduates in my courses on the anthropology of tourism at the University of California, Berkeley.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the volume represents a logical followup to my paper, "Teaching the Anthropology of Tourism" (1980), and my edited collection, "The Anthropology of Tourism" (1983a). As befits a collection of anthropological works, the backgrounds of these student authors were varied: one was a freshman, four were nonmajors, three were foreigners, and only one among them had previously undertaken fieldwork.

I have recommended publication of these papers for three reasons. First, these works represent valuable contributions to the understanding of the field of tourism as a whole; indeed, some focus on topics about which there is no published research to date. Second, these papers were important to the development of my own thought; most were either cited in my 1980 and 1983a publications on tourism or mentioned in their bibliographies. Finally, among these papers are models of research topics that can be undertaken successfully by students with time and distance constraints.

### **Research Themes and Contributions**

More than half of the topics of these papers reflect the limitations imposed on students enrolled in university courses. Thus, they are confined in the main to topics and sites accessible locally in the odd hours between taking classes and accomplishing other student tasks. The exceptions are those based on research carried out in other locations before enrollment in classes (i.e., Hastings on Pacific sailing, Teas on drifter-tourism in Nepal, Stevens on the impact of tourism in the Khumbu-Mount Everest area). Mosher's essay on peasant tourism in China, one further exception, was a project carried out during term under "special dispensation" because of the unique opportunity for the author to return to her natal community after an absence of many years. Thus, the majority of these papers focus on the analysis of domestic tourism in the United States.

More striking is the focus of these papers on the anthropology of tourists, rather than on the socioeconomic-ecological impact of tourism, a more common subject for anthropological research. To some degree, I attribute this emphasis to the spatio-temporal constraints on student projects as outlined above. But, over the years, some full-time students in the same class have studied the impact of tourism locally: for example, on San Francisco's Chinatown, on the coastal areas north and south of San Francisco Bay, and on the Lake Tahoe vicinity. Therefore, I suspect that a second determinant for this focus on tourists themselves may be my own bias, as expressed in both lectures and in the selections chosen by me for inclusion in this volume. (An obvious exception is Stevens' paper in this collection.) As discussed elsewhere (Graburn 1983a), I think our understanding of the impacts of tourism is greater than our understanding of variations and changes in the cultural and psychological factors behind tourists' motivation and behavior. Furthermore, this emphasis on touristic impacts is puzzling, given that we, as social scientists, can do as little here as elsewhere to ameliorate the negative impacts of tourism on indigenous cultures.

### **Tourism and Class**

Social scientists have a common-sense notion that tourism, as they define it, is an almost exclusively middle-class phenomenon. Indeed, in the major theoretical work in the field, MacCannell (1976) posits that modern

tourism is dependent on a set of values common only to contemporary middle-class cultures, a position with which some authors of the papers included here disagree (e.g., Mosher). In addition to the obvious “class-centrism” of researchers, the two overt factors limiting non-middle-class tourism are (a) lack of discretionary income, and (b) lack of cultural self-confidence (Graburn 1983a). Thus, the study of “discretionary time” leads to a focus on leisure in general, which, as Campbell aptly demonstrates in this volume, may exclude tourism for the nonmiddle classes.

The papers by Assefa and Campbell discuss the leisure activities of two non-middle-class groups, urban blacks and urban bus drivers. Both groups are predominantly working class or underclass—urban blacks by reason of income and cultural style and bus drivers by education, preference, and cultural style (since they are relatively affluent). Neither group ventures far afield for leisure activities. Urban blacks, as Assefa notes, rarely travel more than a few miles from their homes for pleasure, both by preference and economic limitation. City bus drivers, Campbell tells us, follow more or less the same pattern. They seldom travel more than a few hundred miles from home by preference, and, when they do, they carry as much of their comfortable material “bubble” with them as possible.

In addition, both Assefa’s and Campbell’s papers attest to the superiority of the anthropological research technique of participant observation—even by mere amateurs—over expensive and extensive quantitative and sociological research. Assefa’s<sup>2</sup> study, in which he used only three or four regular “informants,” points up the methodological flaws of a large-scale institutional research program, which addressed the same question of why Oakland minorities do not use the regional parks in the surrounding suburbs. But whereas the larger study canvassed middle-class, ethnic community leaders, Assefa interviewed inner-city blacks, thereby uncovering a markedly different—and probably more correct—set of explanations. Correspondingly, Campbell,<sup>3</sup> in the larger work (1978) from which this paper is drawn, has shown that middle-class sociological research efforts generate anxiety and false responses from lower or lower-middle-class respondents. Specifically, he shows that such informants recognize all too well the middle-class values concerning productive leisure, values by which they themselves are negatively judged. Resultingly, when they are the targets of survey research, they do not elaborate on the true nature of their leisure activities, concealing their social contacts and their home- and car-improvement projects.

### **Tourism and the Entertainment Industry**

Ritter and Powell also analyze leisure/tourism phenomena in the US—in particular, the Universal Studios Tour in Los Angeles County and the values of tourism and travel expressed in popular music in the past three decades, respectively. Ritter<sup>4</sup> drew upon her experience as a tour guide at Universal Studios to recount the history of the interaction between movie-making and tours at Universal and to analyze the manipulation of this interaction in the cultural construction of front and back stages for tourists. Drawing on MacCannell (1976) and, ultimately, Goffman (1959), she discusses the vital role that the driving forces of the market have played in creating front stage and back stage on the Universal lot and, further, how the role of the tour guide is critical, both in maintaining these illusions (cf. Fine and Speer 1985) and in mystifying the avaricious presence of commercially sponsored arrangements within the tour.<sup>5</sup>

Powell’s<sup>6</sup> study on the touristic messages of pop music also breaks new ground. She shows how the references to travel and to faraway places in pop music from 1960 to 1984 furnish an alternative set of markers (MacCannell 1976), in opposition to the messages conveyed by commercial travel literature and publicity. The former system, she proposes, is aimed at the youth market, whereas the latter is aimed at an older or more settled generation. Starting with the counterculture of the Beach Boys and the Beatles suitable for the youth described by Cohen (1973) and Teas (1988; this issue), she shows that later pop stars promote more realistic travel ideas, within which one strong theme is the emergent independence of young women.

### **Extended Tourism**

The papers of Teas and Hastings, based on their status as participant observers, describe and analyze tourism (primarily of Americans) as a lengthy break from ordinary life. Both emphasize the role of tourism in the reformulation of life, during college (in the case of Teas) and in later “passages” (described by Hastings).

Teas’<sup>7</sup> paper is an entertaining if somewhat jaundiced account of the same “nomads from affluence” described in Cohen’s (1973) classic article. As such, it contributes to the body of literature on this topic (e.g., Vogt 1978; Adler 1985). As required reading in my classes, it is the one most appreciated by students, who find that the anthropological description rings true. Teas, like Powell (1988; this issue), begins with a consideration of the impelling messages of modern media (in this case, movies and books), which may have served her generation in the same way. Teas outlines the stages of extended travel, discussing the status-inversion values of distance, exoticness, and apparent penury. One surprising insight of her penetrating and debunking descriptions of such travel-

ers' impression management is their degree of narcissism, which, she suggests, reduces travel to a sterile experience. She allows us to see that, in reality, extended travel may be viewed as domestic tourism of the first order: the young person is traveling within his or her own mental and cultural world.

In her meticulous description of a three-month sailing cruise across the Pacific, Hastings<sup>8</sup> comes to the same conclusions. She learned that almost all of the members of the party were at a crossroads in their lives. The fact that their destinations included Pitcairn Island and Tahiti was less important than their behavior and interactions on board. She notes the strong significance of Turner's (1969, 1974) "communitas" in the symbols of social leveling, the abandonment of certain normal rules of behavior, and the mechanical solidarity that developed. Hastings' study also represents a significant contribution to the relatively neglected field of the anthropology of cruising; Lett (1983) has described and analyzed the social milieu of short-term yacht charters in the Caribbean, and Foster (1986) has recently done the same for elite small-ship cruises. While the kind of cruising described by Hastings—long-term "roughing it" in a small sailing schooner—is rare, it nonetheless points the way for further research in the wider field of tourism at sea.

### Asian Tourism

The commonality of the papers in the final section of this volume is geography. Mosher and Ikkai describe tourism by Asian peoples (the Chinese and Japanese, respectively), and Stevens provides a thorough analysis of the multiple effects of Indian and non-Asian tourists on Nepal, a poor but targeted country of Asia.

Mosher's<sup>9</sup> paper on the demise of local domestic tourism in rural China steps outside the bounds of usual research. Culturally, the people of the Pearl Delta are (or were, not long ago), peasants in an almost feudal society. Yet, in this area, they had a local tour circuit of "Eight Sights" (mainly natural features), which helped them define their local identity in past times. The idea of "peasant tourism" (if one can call China's rural workers peasants) contradicts the assumption mentioned above—that leisure tourism is a modern middle-class phenomenon (MacCannell 1976)—and supports Nash's (1984) contention that my purview (and, indeed, MacCannell's) has been limited by this assumption. Mosher describes how the Communists, especially the Red Guard of the Cultural Revolution, destroyed many of the sites, thereby depriving the populace of the ability to make the circuit. Thus, while the older generation retains its enthusiasm for the local sites, modernization has delocalized the world view of younger generations, whose tourist targets now include the famous national sites.

Ikkai<sup>10</sup> made use of her position as a "culture broker" (a Japanese woman living in the US, who led tours for young Japanese) to examine the reciprocal relationships between the tourists and their family and friends back home. This research and her examination of the history of domestic tourism in Japan were the inspiration for my own studies on the topic (Graburn 1983b; 1987) and for other studies of Japanese tourists in the US (Moore 1985). Ikkai found that the young Japanese tourists' reciprocal system of parting gifts (given by well-wishers in Japan) and return gifts bought abroad (*senbetsu* and *omiyage*, respectively) follows an age-old tradition, which reaffirms relationships between the absent and the home bound. The endurance of this group orientation has recently been challenged by Moeran (1983) and others, who suggest that the younger generation, derisively called *shinjinrui* (meaning "new humans"), is more selfish and individualistic. If these claims are justified, then they have grave implications not only for Japanese tourism, but for the future of Japanese society as a whole.

Stevens'<sup>11</sup> work is part of his long-term research (1979-88) on the social and ecological problems of contemporary Himalayan Nepal. His paper, based on extensive field and archival work, shows that the entrepreneurial spirit of the Sherpas in the favored region of Khumbu (near Mount Everest), derived in part from their long tradition of trans-Himalayan trade, has allowed for successful capitalization and business development. Although the Sherpas suffer both ecological and political problems, Stevens asserts that their continued autonomy and interaction with the lucrative mountaineering/trekking and tourist industries form a better model for developmental change than those provided by other extralocally planned schemes in Nepal and elsewhere in the Third World.

### Conclusion

Contained in this collection are lessons for students, teachers, and anthropologists of tourism.

For students, the lessons of this collection are twofold. First, neophyte researchers should take advantage of their unique characteristics and life experiences (e.g., background, color, class, gender, and extracurricular activities) and develop these with professional consciousness, either by analysis of prior experience or, if possible, by using their contacts for further research. Second, on a broader level, it may be wise for students to seek out unusual extracurricular work and travel experiences and capitalize on them—not only for their own sakes, but for the good of anthropology.

For teachers, this volume demonstrates that students can carry out worthwhile field research in the university setting. From my own experience, I would suggest that one factor positively influencing the course of this research

is to allow students to suggest their own research topics. This releases their imaginations and allows them to take advantage of opportunities drawing on their unique life experiences.<sup>12</sup>

Anthropologists of tourism will find that many of the papers broach new topics, some that few will ever have a chance to study (e.g., Mosher, Hastings). Others are original in bringing into relation the study of tourism with topics ostensibly tangential to it (e.g., Ritter, Powell). Still others examine populations whose touristic and leisure habits are rarely penetrated by professional researchers (e.g., Assefa, Campbell); they convincingly demonstrate that the more informal method of participant observation produces important insights that cannot be gained from a thousand "surveys." Finally, Stevens' paper, although focusing on a topic already massively researched, stands with the most professional among them. It attests to the value of extensive fieldwork, mastery of the language, dogged archival research, and heartfelt commitment to a people and their struggles—research habits worthy of any anthropological project.

Moreover, this set of research papers is a tribute to the pioneers in our relatively new field. Although Teas did her work before the anthropology of tourism was "born" (cf. Smith 1977),<sup>13</sup> without knowledge of the work of Cohen (1973) on the same topic, the rest of the papers rely heavily on a few key formulations and on the publication of the results of most of the important works in the *Annals of Tourism Research*, (ably guided by Jafar Jafari since 1973). In the study of the nature of tourism itself (rather than its impacts), the foundations were laid by Arnold Van Gennep (1909) and his follower Victor Turner (1969), a fact that I have, in my own work, overstressed, according to Nash (1984). Modern research on this topic, however, undoubtedly owes its debt to the authority most quoted by the student authors, Dean MacCannell (1976), which brings us back to Berkeley, where MacCannell majored in anthropology, graduating in 1973, and studied with his own most powerful influence, Erving Goffman, then professor of sociology.

## Notes

1. These papers are among the best ever written by my students at Berkeley. But I cannot say that they are "the best." A number of others, some cited in my previous works (1980, 1983a), could not be included here for reasons involving lack of copies, length, or reliance on photographs (photographs cannot be published by this journal). In addition, two graduate students have completed their PhD dissertations on the analysis of tourism (Gamper 1982; Passariello 1986) and have already published papers from their research.

2. Brook Assefa was a freshman from Ethiopia, who had previously spent two years in high school in the US. As he notes, he was able to use his blackness as an asset in identifying with his informants. Assefa went on to major in engineering at Berkeley.

3. Robert Campbell came from a lower-income background in southern California, which helped him to identify with his informants. He used his extensive research with bus drivers in an honors thesis (1978), which was awarded the Kroeber Prize that year. Campbell entered graduate school at Berkeley, but soon left for economic reasons. He is now a successful corporate lawyer in Hawaii.

4. Lisa Ritter was a senior at Berkeley, majoring in English. Coming from southern California, she had worked summers as a tour guide for Universal Studios.

5. Another paper by a student in the same course focused on the commercial sponsorship of pavilions at Disneyland, where the student had once worked. Unfortunately, owing in part to problems of confidential information, the paper was never brought to a publishable state.

6. Alison Powell was a music major who had traveled widely. For this analysis, she drew upon her extensive collection of records of popular music of the past three decades.

7. Jane Teas was herself a youthful drifter-tourist in the late 1960s and early 1970s. While in Nepal, she supported herself as a research assistant on a project studying the behavior of the rhesus monkeys in the temples of Kathmandu. It was during this period that Teas undertook the fieldwork described here. Later, she majored in anthropology at Berkeley and went on to earn a PhD in primatology at Johns Hopkins University.

8. Julie Hastings was an anthropology major at the University of Santa Clara. She undertook the research on her Pacific cruise during a term off from college. Hastings cross-registered for my course on the anthropology of tourism at Berkeley during her senior year, when she carried out the major part of the analysis for her BA honors thesis, the basis of this article.

9. Maggie Mosher was born and raised in Guangtong Province, China, and came to the US during her childhood. She majored in anthropology at Berkeley. During one term of her junior year, she returned to China to visit her family. She took with her her husband, Steven W. Mosher, at that time a student at Stanford University. Later, he returned to the same village and carried out fieldwork that resulted in the publication of two books (Mosher 1983; 1985).

10. Mariko Ikkai was raised in Osaka, Japan, but spent some of her youth in Brazil and the US. She was an anthropology major at Berkeley, where she transferred from West Chester State College. Ikkai also worked as a guide for Japanese tourists in the San Francisco Bay area.

11. Stan Stevens, like Jane Teas, was a youthful drifter-tourist in Asia in the 1970s. His interest in Nepal was deepened by his seven months' stay in the Himalayas in 1979. Stevens subsequently enrolled at Berkeley, where he majored in geography. He returned to Nepal for further studies (on the impact of tourism, deforestation, trans-Himalayan trade) in 1982-83, 1984, 1985, and, for his PhD research, in 1987-88. He has worked and written extensively on plans for the amelioration of some of the problems mentioned in his paper, particularly on the establishment and management of national parks and nature reserves (Stevens 1988).
12. In most of my upper division courses, I allow students to write a research paper in place of the final exam, provided they have done well in the mid-term exam and other assignments. In all cases, I ask them to prepare a prospectus for their term paper, complete with hypotheses, sources of data, and bibliography, before I consider their request.
13. Valene Smith organized a symposium on the anthropology of tourism at the 1974 Annual Meetings of the American Anthropological Association in Mexico City.

## References Cited

Adler, Judith

- 1985 Youth on the Road: Reflections on the History of Tramping. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12:335-354.

Campbell, Robert

- 1978 Aspects of Work and Leisure among City Bus Drivers. Unpublished BA Honors Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Cohen, Erik

- 1973 Nomads from Affluence: Notes on the Phenomenon of Drifter Tourism. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 14:89-103.

Fine, Elizabeth C., and Jean H. Speer

- 1985 Tour Guide Performance as Sight Sacralization. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12:73-95.

Foster, George M.

- 1986 South Seas Cruise: A Case Study of a Short-lived Society. *Annals of Tourism Research* 13:215-238.

Gamper, Josef

- 1982 The Impact of Tourism on Two Alpine Communities in Austria. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Goffman, Erving

- 1959 *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Graburn, Nelson H. H.

- 1980 Teaching the Anthropology of Tourism. *International Social Science Journal* 32:56-68.  
 1983a The Anthropology of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10:9-34.  
 1983b To Pray, Pay and Play: The Cultural Structure of Japanese Domestic Tourism. Aix-en-Provence: Centre des Hautes Etudes Touristiques, Les Cahiers du Tourisme, Series B, No. 26.  
 1987 Material Symbols in Japanese Domestic Tourism. In *Mirror and Metaphor: Material and Social Constructions of Reality*. Daniel Ingersoll and Gordon Bronitsky, eds. Pp. 17-27. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Lett, James W.

- 1983 Ludic and Liminoid Aspects of Charter Yacht Tourism in the Caribbean. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10:35-56.

MacCannell, Dean

- 1976 *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken.

Moeran, Brian

- 1983 The Language of Japanese Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10:93-108.

Moore, Alexander

- 1985 Rosanzerusu is Los Angeles: An Anthropological Enquiry of Japanese Tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12:619-643.

Mosher, Steven W.

- 1983 *Broken Earth: The Rural Chinese*. New York: Free Press.  
 1985 *Journey to Forbidden China*. New York: Free Press.

Nash, Dennison

- 1984 The Ritualization of Tourism: Comment on Graburn's *The Anthropology of Tourism*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 11:503-507.

Passariello, Phyllis

- 1986 Novelty's Pilgrims: Change in Tourism in a Mexican Beach Community. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University

- of California, Berkeley.
- Smith, Valene, ed.  
1977 *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Stevens, Stan  
1988 Sacred and Profane Himalayas. *Natural History* 97:26-35.
- Teas, Jane  
1988 "I'm Studying Monkeys; What Do You Do?"—Youth and Travelers in Nepal. *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 67-68; 35-41.
- Turner, Victor  
1969 *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine.  
1974 *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Van Gennep, Arnold  
1909 *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vogt, Jay W.  
1978 Wandering: Youth and Travel Behavior. *In* *Tourism and Behavior: Studies in Third World Societies*. Valene Smith, ed. Pp. 19-40. Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary College Press.