



The Sociology of Tourism: Approaches, Issues, and Findings

Erik Cohen

Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 10 (1984), 373-392.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0360-0572%281984%2910%3C373%3ATSOTAI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-O>

Annual Review of Sociology is currently published by Annual Reviews.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/annrevs.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

THE SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM: APPROACHES, ISSUES, AND FINDINGS

Erik Cohen

Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem,
Jerusalem, Israel

Abstract

This article reviews the body of sociological and anthropological literature on tourism. Following a historical survey of the field, the principal concepts and approaches to the study of tourism are surveyed. The main body of the paper discusses the four principal issue areas in the field: (a) the tourist—his motivations, attitudes, reactions, and roles; (b) the relations and perceptions of tourists and locals; (c) the structure of the tourist system; and (d) the socioeconomic and sociocultural impact of tourism.

INTRODUCTION

The sociology of tourism is an emergent specialty concerned with the study of touristic motivations, roles, relationships, and institutions and of their impact on tourists and on the societies who receive them.

The scientific study of tourism originated in continental Europe, which was the first region to experience the impact of mass tourism. The Italian L. Bodio published the first social scientific article on the subject in 1899. The major early contributions, however, were in German (cf Homberg 1978:36-37).

The first specifically sociological writings on tourism were also in German, beginning with L. von Wiese's (1930) classic article and leading to the first full-length sociological work on the subject by H. J. Knebel (1960). Ogilvie's (1933) book on tourism is the first social scientific treatise on the subject in English; it was followed by Norval's (1936) book on the tourist industry. The subject, however, received little attention until well into the post-World War II

period when the rapid expansion of tourism provoked some spirited, critical writings (Mitford 1959; Boorstin 1964:77-117) and the first empirical studies (Nuñez 1963, Forster 1964).

The study of tourism as a sociological specialty rather than merely as an exotic, marginal topic emerged only in the 1970s with Cohen's (1972) typological essay and MacCannell's (1973) first theoretical synthesis. Since the mid-1970s, the field has grown rapidly, which is attested by the publication of a series of treatises and reviews (Young 1973; L. Turner & Ash 1975; MacCannell 1976; Noronha 1977; de Kadt 1979:3-76) and general collections of articles (V. L. Smith 1977c, 1978a; *Tourismus und Kulturwandel* 1978; Cohen 1979d; de Kadt 1979:77-335; Lengyel 1980; Graburn 1983b).

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES

The most widely accepted, but technical, definition of the tourist was proposed by the International Union of Official Travel Organizations (IUOTO) in 1963 and approved in 1968 by the World Tourist Organization (Leiper 1979:393). It states that (international) tourists are "temporary visitors staying at least twenty-four hours in the country visited and the purpose of whose journey can be classified under one of the following headings: (a) leisure (recreation, holiday, health, study, religion and sport); (b) business (family mission, meeting)" (IUOTO 1963:14).

This definition is useful primarily for "statistical, legislative and industrial purposes" (Burkart & Medlik 1974:3), but it is unsatisfactory for most sociological work because it is too broad and theoretically barren. There have been numerous efforts to devise a theoretically fruitful, sociological definition of the "tourist", begun by German sociologists (Knebel 1960:1-6) and leading to Cohen's (1974) and Leiper's (1979) work, and P. L. Pearce's (1982:28-30) appraisal of touristic taxonomies. None of the general conceptualizations of the tourist has been widely adopted, however. Only P. L. Pearce (1982:29-37) has studied people's conceptions of "tourist-related roles" empirically, following up on Cohen's approach.

There are considerable differences among students in the field in their general philosophical and ideological perspectives, as well as in their theoretical approaches to tourism; these have produced a variety of conceptual approaches. We have selected eight of the most important ones for consideration.

1. *Tourism as commercialized hospitality*: The focus is on the visitor component (Cohen 1974:545-46) of the tourist's role. Its proponents conceive of the touristic process as a commercialization of the traditional guest-host relationship through which strangers were given a temporary role and status in the

society they visited (von Wiese 1930; cf Knebel 1960:2). Tourism is thus viewed as a commercialized and eventually industrialized form of hospitality (Taylor 1932; Hiller 1976, 1977; Leiper 1979:400–3). This approach proved fruitful in studying the evolution and dynamics of relationships between tourists and locals and in analyzing conflicts within roles and institutions dealing with tourists.

2. *Tourism as democratized travel*: The emphasis is on the traveler component of the tourist role; the tourist is viewed as a kind of traveler marked by some distinct analytical traits (Cohen 1974; P. L. Pearce 1982:28–40). The authors who pioneered this approach saw modern mass tourism as a democratized expansion of the aristocratic travel of an earlier age (Boorstin 1964:77–117). Though anchoring tourism in an area—namely travel—that has not been explored by sociologists (Nash 1981:462), this perspective generated some important work on the historical transformation of touristic roles (e.g. Knebel 1960, L. Turner & Ash 1975).

3. *Tourism as a modern leisure activity*: Tourism is seen as a type of leisure (Dumazdier 1967:123–38; P. L. Pearce 1982:20) and the tourist as a “person at leisure who also travels” (Nash 1981:462). Its protagonists see leisure as an activity free of obligations (Dumazdier 1967:14), but they usually abstain from investigating the deeper cultural significance of leisure activities. They take a functionalist view, identifying leisure—and hence tourism—with recreation (e.g. Scheuch 1981:1099; see also Cohen 1979b:183–85). This approach informs much of the macrosociological and institutional research on modern tourism (e.g. Dumazdier 1967:123–38; Scheuch 1981).

4. *Tourism as a modern variety of the traditional pilgrimage*: This perspective focuses on the deeper structural significance of modern tourism and identifies it with pilgrimages in traditional societies; it was proposed by MacCannell (1973:589). Graburn’s (1977) paper, identifying tourism as a form of the “sacred journey,” brings the study of tourism even closer to that of the pilgrimage (but see Cohen 1984).

5. *Tourism as an expression of basic cultural themes*: The emphasis here is on the deeper cultural meaning of tourism. Rejecting the general, “etic” approach to tourism (e.g. Nash 1981), its advocates are trying to reach an “emic” understanding of its culture-specific, symbolic meaning that is “based on the views of the vacationers themselves” (Gottlieb 1982:167; cf Graburn 1983a). The program implicit in such an approach would eventually do away with tourism as an analytic concept and would lead to a comparative study of different, culture-specific varieties of travel.

6. *Tourism as an acculturative process*: Proponents of this viewpoint focus upon the effects that tourists have on their hosts and strive to integrate the study of tourism into the wider framework of the theory of acculturation (Nuñez 1963:347–78). It has not been very popular, however (but see Nettekoven

1979:144–45), even though tourists in many remote areas appear to be important agents of an often caricatured form of Westernization.

7. *Tourism as a type of ethnic relations*: Advocates of this approach strive to integrate the analysis of the tourist-host relationship into the wider field of ethnicity and ethnic relations (Pi-Sunyer 1977, Gamper 1981). Its major proponent is van den Berghe (1980) (cf also van den Berghe & Keyes 1984). This approach dovetails with some work on the impact of the production of ethnic arts for the tourist market on ethnic identities (Graburn 1976b:23–30).

8. *Tourism as a form of neocolonialism*: The focus is on the role of tourism in creating dependencies between tourism-generating, “metropolitan” countries and tourism-receiving, “peripheral” nations that replicate colonial or “imperialist” forms of domination and structural underdevelopment. This approach was explicitly formulated in a paper by Nash (1977); Matthews (1978:74–86) has discussed its various forms. The most ambitious empirical attempt to analyze tourism in these terms on a global scale is Høivik & Heiberg’s (1980).

THE PRINCIPAL ISSUE AREAS IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

Sociological research on tourism falls naturally into four principal issue areas: the tourist, relations between tourists and locals, the structure and functioning of the tourist system, and the consequences of tourism.

The Tourist

Research on the tourist is extremely varied, but the bulk of work in this area consists of purely empirical, “touristological” surveys and trend analyses that are oriented toward meeting the practical needs of governments and the tourist industry. They deal primarily with the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of tourists (e.g. Burkart & Medlik 1974:80–103); the frequency, purpose, length, and type of trip; and the nature of tourists’ destinations and the kinds of activities undertaken. Though of rather limited sociological relevance in themselves, such data are important resources for secondary analysis, enabling scholars to identify the major trends in modern tourism (e.g. Scheuch 1981).

International tourism became a major modern mass phenomenon after World War II when it came to embrace practically all social classes in industrialized Western societies (Scheuch 1981:1095). This expansion was made possible by rising standards of living and the shortening of the work year, which were accompanied by longer paid vacations in the industrialized Western countries and a rapid improvement in the means of transportation (Dumazdier 1967:129–30; Young 1973:30; Scheuch 1981:1094). To these factors the enhanced motivation to travel should also be added; it will be discussed below.

The rate of expansion since World War II has been spectacular: in 1950 there were still only 25.3 million international tourists; in 1960, 75.3 million; in 1970, 169.0 million (Young 1973:52); and in 1981, 291 million. Domestic tourism apparently grew at an even steeper rate and was estimated at 2.3 billion in 1981 (World Tourism Trends 1982:1). The major destinations of international tourism are still North America and Europe. The share captured by other world regions, while still miniscule, is rapidly growing (Cleverdon 1979:13).

On the whole, men travel more than women; older people travel somewhat less than younger and middle-aged ones; and the number of younger tourists is on the increase (Young 1973:31; D. G. Pearce 1978:4-7). Urban residents take far more yearly holiday trips than rural inhabitants (Dumazdier 1967:124-61; Scheuch 1981:1094).

A greater proportion of people in the higher income categories take yearly holiday trips, while those in the highest brackets take more than one trip a year on the average (Newman 1973:235). Despite the democratization of travel, significant class differences still exist in the industrialized Western countries, not only in the propensity to travel but also in the distance and type of destination, the organization of the trip, the motivations and traveling style, and the deeper cultural motifs informing tourism (Newman 1973; Gottlieb 1982:165).

The sociopsychological study of tourism has only recently come to the attention of professional psychologists (P. L. Pearce 1982; Stringer 1984). Several topics have been closely examined: motivation (Crompton 1979; Dann 1981), the cultural or environmental shock experienced at the destination (Cort & King 1979, P. L. Pearce 1981), decision-making (Myers & Moncrief 1978, V. L. Smith 1979), attitudes (Stoffle et al 1979, Farrell 1979), and satisfaction (Pizam et al 1978). Of particular relevance for our purposes is the recent reorientation in tourist motivation research. Instead of conceiving of tourist motivation "as a simple short-term process assessed by measuring the immediate satisfactions and causes of travel behavior" (P. L. Pearce 1982:51) as leisure researchers are prone to do, motivation for travel is now increasingly understood in terms of how it relates to the individual's long-term psychological needs and life-plans; intrinsic motives such as self-actualization seem to be particularly important. This approach accords with the work of those sociologists who view the tourist's motivations and desired experiences in the context of the basic structural themes and cultural symbols of modern society (Dann 1977; MacCannell 1973, 1976; Cohen 1979b; 1982c:1-16).

MacCannell conceives of tourism as the modern equivalent of the religious pilgrimage: the two are homologous in that "both are quests for authentic experiences" (1973:593). He argues that modern peoples' quest for authenticity is similar to the "concern for the sacred in primitive society" (MacCannell 1973:590), and it is thus analogous to the religious quest for ultimate reality.

Owing, however, to the shallowness and inauthenticity of modern life and the alienation of modern man, "reality and authenticity are thought to be elsewhere: in other historical periods and other cultures, in purer, simpler lifestyles" (MacCannell 1976:3). The search for authenticity thus induces moderns to become tourists. This seminal idea is combined with another one—namely, that structurally, "*sightseeing is a ritual performed to the differentiations of society.*" (MacCannell 1973:13; italics in original). The differentiations are symbolized in the variety of attractions, which are the modern equivalent of the undifferentiated totemic symbols of simpler societies. Although attractions are potential expressions of authenticity, not all of them are equally authentic (Schudson 1979:1251). In fact, their authenticity is frequently staged by the hosts who thus surreptitiously subvert the tourist's endeavor. Caught in a staged "tourist space" from which there is no exit, modern mass tourists are denied access to the back regions of the host society where genuine authenticity can be found and are presented instead with "false backs." The unstated conclusion is that tourism is in fact a futile quest.

MacCannell's ideas have inspired much empirical work in recent years (e.g. Buck 1978a:221–22; 1978b; Schmidt 1979; Papson 1981; Graburn 1983a). His approach, however, has also been criticized and modified along various lines (Cohen 1979b; Nash 1981:462; Greenwood 1982; Schudson 1979:1252–53).

Like Boorstin (1964:77–117) before him, MacCannell talks of the tourist as a unitary role-type. There is overwhelming empirical evidence, however, that actual tourists differ considerably from one another in their motivations (Cohen 1979b), travelling styles, and activities, among other things. Various criteria have been proposed to classify tourists and tourism (see Cohen 1972, 1974; Noronha 1977:6–9; V. L. Smith 1977b; Knox 1978:3–5).

V. L. Smith's (1977b) typology is based on a combination of the number of tourists and their adaptation to local norms, while Cohen's (1972) typology of tourist roles is based on the extent of the tourist's exposure to the strangeness of the host environment as against his seclusion within the "environmental bubble" of his home environment that is supplied by the touristic establishment. Four types of tourists—the organized and the individual mass tourist, the explorer, and the drifter—are distinguished. Much of the recent research on tourists can be classified using Smith's or Cohen's typologies. Most of the literature refers at least implicitly to the mass tourist (e.g. Boorstin 1964:77–117; MacCannell 1976; Hiller 1976, 1977), often mistakingly assuming that he or she represents all tourists. Only a few studies, however, focus specifically on organized mass tourism (Nieto Piñeroba 1977:150–51; U. Wagner 1977). Evans is one of the few who deals expressly with the explorer (1978:48–50). Drifters or "travellers" have been the subject of several papers (e.g. Cohen 1973, 1982b; ten Have 1974; Vogt 1976). Only a few studies, however, have

explicitly compared different types of tourists and their impact on their destinations (e.g. Cohen 1982b; Evans 1978:48–51).

There are few detailed studies of tourist behavior. The most common kind is studies of vacationing behavior on beaches and in seaside resorts (Edgerton 1979, Laurent 1973, U. Wagner 1977, Cohen 1982b) that very strongly bring out the antithetical character of the vacation as compared to ordinary life. In the former, normality is suspended and the individual is liberated from his or her ordinary preoccupations (Laurent 1973:14, 18). Life at the beach is experienced as “out of time and place,” as a relaxing, paradisiacal, or ludic existence (Cohen 1982b:209; Laurent 1973:179), that is separate from the ordinary life both of the tourist and even of the surrounding population. Cohen (1982b:210) and Laurent (1973:170–71) are less sanguine than U. Wagner (1977:42–45), though, about the extent to which a Turnerian “communitas” actually emerges on the beaches; rather, in Edgerton’s (1979) fitting phrase, tourists on beaches seem typically to be “alone together.”

Tourists and Locals

A large number of publications deal either primarily or incidentally with relations between locals and tourists or “Hosts and Guests,” in the somewhat ironic title of V. L. Smith’s (1977c) book on the subject. Few studies deal specifically, however, with the nature and dynamics of the tourist-local relationship, which has three principal dimensions: people’s interactions, perceptions and attitudes [see reviews by P. L. Pearce (1982:68–96) and by Knox (1978)]. Sutton initiated the analysis of the distinct character of the tourist-local interaction and characterized it as a “series of encounters [between] visitors who are on the move to enjoy themselves. . . and hosts who are relatively stationary and who have the function of catering to these visitors’ needs and wishes” (1967:220). Such encounters are essentially transitory, nonrepetitive and asymmetrical; the participants are oriented toward achieving immediate gratification rather than toward maintaining a continuous relationship.

These basic traits of the “encounter” have been further amplified in later research. Due to the transitory and nonrepetitive nature of the relationship, the participants do not have to take account of the effects their present actions will have on the relationship in the future, hence, there is neither a felt necessity nor an opportunity to create mutual trust. Consequently, such “relationships are particularly open to deceit, exploitation and mistrust, since both tourists and natives can easily escape the consequences of hostility and dishonesty” (van den Berghe 1980:388). The asymmetry of the relationship and the quest for immediate gratification compound these possibilities. Sutton focused mainly on the asymmetry of knowledge where the host has an advantage over the visitor, which accounts for tourists’ alleged “gullibility” (e.g. Mitford 1959:6;

Boorstin 1964:107). But other asymmetries also exist. For example, the meaning of the encounter is different for each of the participants: tourism means work for most locals, leisure for the visitors, and this situation creates misunderstandings and conflicts of interest (V. L. Smith 1977a:59; Nieto Piñeroba 1977:149).

The tourist-local relationship is, to varying degrees, embedded in and regulated by two sociocultural systems: a native system, which is invaded by tourism, and the emergent tourist system itself. The principal evolutionary dynamics of the relationship consist of a transition from the former to the latter. Studies of this evolution usually present the process as a commercialization or "commoditization" (Greenwood 1977) of hospitality: Tourists are initially treated as part of the traditional guest-host relationship (Pi-Sunyer 1977:150–51), but as their numbers increase, they become less and less welcome (Cohen 1982a:248). Pressures then build up that transform the guest-host relationship that is based on customary, but neither precise nor obligatory, reciprocity into a commercial one that is based on remuneration. This transformation involves incorporating hospitality—an area that many societies view as founded on values that are the very opposite of economic ones—into the economic domain. Therefore, it is frequently a slow and tortuous process (Mansur 1972:65; Cohen 1982a:246–49).

As tourism moves out of the realm of native hospitality, it often passes through an anomic stage during which locals develop what Sutton (1967:221) has termed a predatory orientation toward tourists. They strive to extract as much gain as possible from each encounter, irrespective of the long-term consequences that such conduct may have on the tourist flow. During this stage, which is often marked by considerable hostility to tourists (P. L. Pearce 1982:83–85), a significant increase in tourist-oriented discrimination, deviance, and petty crime takes place (e.g. Nieto Piñeroba 1977:149; Pi-Sunyer 1977:154–55; Cohen 1982b:219–21). Such occurrences, however, are detrimental to the long-term development of tourism, and they give rise to efforts—on the part of either tourist entrepreneurs or the authorities—to create and institutionalize a professionalized tourist system.

The principal motive of professionalization is to preserve and enhance the area's reputation and thereby ensure the long-term benefits of a continuous and growing flow of tourists. Though economically motivated, a professionalized local-tourist relationship does not take on the character of a wholly depersonalized, neutral economic exchange. Rather, it becomes professionally "staged" in MacCannell's sense, with the locals "playing the natives" and the tourist establishment's personnel correctly providing a competently "personalized" service. Professionalization thus consists of the effort to surmount the potential conflict between the economic and the social components of the service role. While this conflict is never completely resolved (Shamir 1978), professionalization may prevent or attenuate host hostility (de Kadt 1979:58–59); more

often, however, it merely becomes an outer veneer of exaggerated servility, and considerable host hostility lingers on beneath it (e.g. Fukunaga 1975:61, 226).

The attitudes and mutual perceptions of tourists and locals have been studied primarily from the locals' perspective; there is little reliable information on the impact of touring on the tourist (P. L. Pearce 1982:85). In the past, advocates of tourism claimed that it improves international understanding (e.g. Waters 1966:110–11) while their critics denied this (e.g. Joerges & Karsten 1978:6), but both claims remain largely unsubstantiated. P. L. Pearce suggests, on the basis of the meager evidence available, that "tourists do develop, albeit marginally, more positive attitudes to their hosts as a consequence of their travelling" (1982:92); but he also thinks that "holiday experiences tend to confirm pre-existing attitudes" (1982:92)—negative as well as positive ones.

Turning now to the locals' perspective, we should note that tourists are virtually never the first strangers to penetrate even the more isolated societies of the world. They are usually preceded by conquerors, administrators, traders, missionaries, adventurers, anthropologists, etc. (cf, for example, V. L. Smith 1977a:52–53). Such prior contacts condition the locals' initial perceptions of and attitudes towards tourists who may be classified in traditional terms as friends or enemies (Dress 1979:129) or even as foreign "soldiers" (Leach 1973:357). According to Pi-Sunyer, insofar as they are accepted as guests, they are at first treated as individuals in a personalized relationship (1977:150–51). With the advent of widespread tourism, however, locals become incapable of relating to each visitor individually and tend to create an "ethnic typology." As tourism develops further, mass tourists may become separated in the locals' consciousness from normal humankind and debarred of their "essential individuality and human qualities" (Pi-Sunyer 1977:155). This perception legitimizes exploitative behavior (see also P. L. Pearce 1982:84; Cohen 1982b:220).

Doxey (1976) proposed a general evolutionary model of change in locals' attitudes toward tourists consisting of four stages: euphoria, apathy, annoyance, and antagonism. A positive attitude toward tourism may indeed accompany the initial stages of its development (e.g. Belisle & Hoy 1980, J. A. Pearce 1980), but euphoria does not always mark the beginning of tourism, especially when it is imposed from the outside (Fukunaga 1975:209; Blakeway 1980:79–80).

Antagonism is certainly found in many touristic areas (Noronha 1977:43–46; Knox 1978:14–20), particularly where tourist densities have increased rapidly (Greenwood 1972:90; V. L. Smith 1977a:57), and the tourist industry has exacerbated the socioeconomic and cultural differences between locals and tourists or engendered competition over scarce local resources (Jordan 1980:43; Kent 1975; Knox 1978:14–15). It may also be stimulated or reinforced by the conduct of tourists, especially in situations of considerable

asymmetry where there is little segregation (P. L. Pearce 1982:84–85; V. L. Smith 1977a:59). Tourists also frequently serve as the concrete focus of a more general resentment toward white foreigners found, for example, in some ex-colonies (Young 1973:141; Knox 1978:17; de Kadt 1979:59–61). Nonetheless, antagonism toward tourists is not a necessary or ubiquitous consequence of mass tourism (Manning 1979:173–75). Various factors, such as cultural similarities or the involvement of locals in tourism, may modify or improve local attitudes (Noronha 1977:43; Knox 1978:9). The local people also learn to cope with the foreigners and develop a tolerance toward their peculiar behavior (Stott 1978:82). Mature touristic areas such as Switzerland where tourism is a highly professionalized occupational area may thus be marked by an absence of both host hostility and genuine human contact between locals and visitors (cf MacCannell 1976:106).

The Development and Structure of the Tourist System

Modern tourism is an ecological, economic, and political system that is complex and global. As it matures, it attains a degree of separation from the rest of society (Cohen 1972:171–73). The system is marked by a centrifugal tendency (Christaller 1955:5–6) as it constantly expands into new areas, whether in a spontaneous “organic” pattern as a result of some inner impetus or in a sponsored, induced form through the efforts of the national authorities or large-scale developers (Cohen 1972:198; 1979c:24).

The core of the global tourist system is located in the major tourism-generating countries (Williams & Zelinsky 1970); its modern roots reach back to the Grand Tour (Brodsky-Porges 1981), which provided the geographical backbone from which the system expanded into more and more peripheral areas. It is presently penetrating the most remote and hitherto unaccessible areas of the Third World and the polar regions (e.g. Leach 1973, Cohen 1979a, Reich 1980). Speculation on tourism in space has already begun (e.g. Kaufmann 1983).

Socioeconomically, the system hinges on a group of national and increasingly transnational corporate actors and governmental and intergovernmental agencies, such as airlines; travel companies, travel agencies, and tour operators; hotel chains; international travel organizations (e.g. International Association of Travel Agents (IATA) and IUOTO); and various governmental and intergovernmental organizations (Matthews 1978, Young 1973, Cleverdon 1979, Dunning & McQueen 1982). Studies of the major corporate actors on the global scene reveal extensive metropolitan domination of the tourist industry (Matthews 1978:43). The tourist industry is thus becoming internationalized (Lanfant 1980:23; see also Dunning & McQueen 1982). The structure of the tourist industry on the global level has important repercussions at the national and local levels in the host countries. These effects are the principal preoccupa-

tion of those who study tourism from the perspective of dependency theory (e.g. Pérez 1973; Wood 1979, 1981; Britton 1982; for a critique of this approach, see Matthews 1978:79–81, 85–86).

Sociologists and anthropologists have studied the dynamics of the tourist system mainly on the regional and local levels. The “genetic approach” was pioneered by Forster who drew attention to the processual nature of tourism, which “creates a type of ‘cumulative causation’, and ultimately a new economic base” (1964:218) as it penetrates a new area. Greenwood’s (1972) study of Fuenterrabia is the most influential publication in this field.

Building on Greenwood’s work, Noronha (1977:17–27) elaborated a general model of the development of tourism that consists of three stages: I. discovery; II. local response and initiative; and III. institutionalization. The model is based on the assumption that tourism in a newly discovered destination initially develops spontaneously and is based on local initiatives. Later on, however, as local resources prove insufficient to support further growth, the “wider political authorities and economic blocks intervene” until control eventually passes into the hands of outsiders during Stage III. In the process, craft tourism changes to industrial tourism (Pi-Sunyer 1973:13–18; Rodenburg 1980) as facilities become bigger and are upgraded to international standards. The general implication of the model is that, as the industry develops, locals lose control and their relative share in the total benefits from tourism gradually declines (Rodenburg 1980:186; but see Jenkins 1982). Peck & Lepie (1977:160–61), however, argue that there is not merely one but several types of dynamics of development; their typology resembles Cohen’s (1979c:24; 1982b; 1983b) distinction between those local tourist systems that grow organically and those whose initial growth is induced from the outside.

The organic model is paralleled in the geographer’s concept of the “resort cycle” (Stansfield 1978) or the “tourist area cycle” (Butler 1980). In his sophisticated model, Butler differentiates among five developmental stages: (a) evolution, (b) involvement, (c) development and consolidation, and (d) stagnation, which (e) either leads to decline or is transformed by rejuvenation. The latter is well illustrated by the attempts to revitalize Atlantic City, primarily through legalized gambling (Stansfield 1978:249–50). Hovinen (1982) has applied a modified version of this model to Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. It appears to describe adequately the evolution of many older resorts such as Nice (Nash 1979) or Queenstown, New Zealand (D. G. Pearce 1980), that grew organically, but it probably is not applicable to those newer resorts in Third World countries whose growth has been extraneously induced.

The Impact of Tourism

The impact of tourism is by far the most intensively researched issue area within the sociology of tourism. The great bulk of the impact studies focus on

the host community or society; the effect on the tourists' country of origin is neglected.

Most authors distinguish between the socioeconomic and sociocultural effects of tourism (UNESCO 1976). Noronha (1977:51–77) and Cleverdon (1979) have provided the most comprehensive surveys of the range of socioeconomic impacts that tourism has under different conditions. The socioeconomic studies cover primarily eight major topics: foreign exchange, income, employment, prices, the distribution of benefits, ownership and control, development, and government revenue. There is considerable agreement on the impact tourism has on them. It is well established that tourism generates foreign exchange (Gray 1982:29–32; Varley 1978:37; Wall & Ali 1977:45–46), income for the host country (Cleverdon 1979:32–36), and employment for the local population (e.g. Noronha 1977:52–60; Cleverdon 1979:39–42; de Kadt 1979:35–44). Tourism often becomes an important source of governmental revenue as well (Cleverdon 1979:45–48), which may be one of the reasons why many governments are eager to encourage its rapid development. Nonetheless, the positive economic effects of tourism frequently fall significantly short of expectations or predictions.

In addition, tourism generates or reinforces inflationary tendencies by putting pressure upon resources whose supply is inelastic—particularly some types of food (Urbanowicz 1977:88; Cohen 1982b:218) and land (e.g. Noronha 1979:188). Thus, while tourism frequently benefits those locals who are directly involved in it, it may cause hardships for the rest of the population.

The development of a tourist industry often involves the penetration of outsiders (e.g. Cohen 1983b; Noronha 1979:188) and both national and foreign outside financial interests (Cleverdon 1979:20–22, 56–67; Noronha 1977:19–20; de Kadt 1979:28–32). This process frequently leads to a loss of local control over the industry (Greenwood 1972; Rodenburg 1980:184).

Beyond these points of general agreement, the findings vary a great deal. Tourism has the most serious dislocating effects (Forster 1964:219) and yields the smallest relative benefits for locals when large-scale, high-standard facilities are rapidly introduced by outside developers into an otherwise poorly developed area; dependency, rather than development, then results (Cleverdon 1979:49–50; Hiller 1979; Gesheker 1978). Under such conditions, the disproportionate growth of the tourist sector fails to engender linkages with other sectors, particularly with agriculture (e.g. Elkan 1975:129; Wilson 1979:235; Cleverdon 1979:43); rather, it causes dislocations, thus institutionalizing structural underdevelopment.

Where small-scale, locally owned, lower-standard, “craft” tourism is slowly introduced into a less-developed context, gross earnings may be smaller, but a greater percentage will be locally retained and there will be fewer disruptive effects (Rodenburg 1980). There is a better chance that linkages with the local

economy will be established (e.g. Hermans 1981). The impetus such tourism provides may not suffice to stimulate sustained local development (Cohen 1982b:224; Jenkins 1982:235), however, in the absence of sufficient local capital and technical and entrepreneurial resources.

The sociocultural impacts of tourism are numerous and varied, but most of them can be classified under one of ten major topics: community involvement in wider frameworks, the nature of interpersonal relations, the bases of social organization, the rhythm of social life, migration, the division of labor, stratification, the distribution of power, deviance, and customs and the arts. There is a broad agreement among scholars on the findings about most of these topics.

Under tourism the local community becomes increasingly involved in the wider national and international systems, with a concomitant loss of local autonomy; the community's welfare comes to depend more and more upon external factors (such as changing fashions and worldwide prosperity or recession) over which it has no control (Greenwood 1972:90).

On the level of local interpersonal relations, tourism tends to loosen diffuse solidarities and increase individualization (e.g. Stott 1978:81) and creates stress and conflicts (Redclift 1973:7-8; Boissevain 1977:530; Andronicou 1979:248-49); these in turn generate pressures for a greater formalization of local life. But under some circumstances, especially among marginal ecological or ethnic groups, it also produces a reaction in the opposite direction—i.e. a strengthening of group solidarity in the face of the intruding foreigners (e.g. Boissevain 1977:530-32; Reynoso y Valle & de Regt 1979:133).

Tourism's major impact on the bases of social organization, particularly in simple and traditional societies, consists of an expansion of the economic domain: some areas of life that were not primarily regulated by economic criteria become commercialized or "commoditized" (Greenwood 1977). Moreover, considerations of economic gain take a more prominent place in locals' attitudes and relationships—not only in their dealings with tourists, but also among themselves.

Many researchers have noted the impact that tourism has on the rhythm of social life. Tourism is a highly seasonal activity that drastically affects the traditional way of life in agricultural communities (e.g. Clarke 1981:453-55; Greenwood 1972; Jordan 1980). It also changes the daily division of time between work and leisure for employees in the industry (e.g. Boissevain 1979:87-88), which may, in turn, affect family life.

Tourism creates new employment opportunities in the host area and hence influences migration patterns in two principal directions: it helps the community retain members who would otherwise migrate away, particularly unemployed or underemployed youths in economically marginal areas such as islands or mountains; but it also attracts outsiders who are searching for work or

economic opportunity and who often come from other branches of the economy, particularly agriculture (e.g. Noronha 1977:54–55, 67; de Kadt 1979:35–36, 43; Cohen 1983b). Thus, in mature tourist areas, tourism spurs urbanization (e.g. Rambaud 1967; McKean 1976a:138; Preau 1982).

One of the most ubiquitously noted effects of tourism is its impact on the division of labor, particularly between the sexes. By creating new kinds of employment, tourism draws into the labor force parts of the local population previously outside it—specifically, young women who now find employment either in tourist services, such as hotels (e.g. Noronha 1977:65; de Kadt 1979:43–44); in the production of crafts and souvenirs for the market (e.g. Boissevain 1979:83–84; Swain 1977); or in tourism-oriented prostitution. This change, in turn, affects not only the division of labor within the household but also the status of women vis-a-vis their families and husbands, and the control of parents over children. It occasionally leads to increased conflict and deviance within the family (e.g. Noronha 1977:65–66, Boissevain & Sarracino-Inglott 1979:275).

The impact of tourism on stratification has been noted by many researchers (e.g. de Kadt 1979:47–49), but the issues involved have not always been analytically distinguished. Tourism certainly promotes a change in the criteria of stratification (e.g. Stott 1978:81): by placing greater emphasis on the economic domain, it enhances the value of money as a criterion of stratification vs more traditional criteria such as a person's origin or status-honor. It thus tends to effect a transformation of the existing stratificational system (Greenwood 1972:89; Reynoso y Valle & de Regt 1979:133). Moreover, even when its consequences are less profound, it creates new social strata, particularly middle classes (de Kadt 1979:47–48).

The revaluation of local resources because of the new uses to which they are put as a result of tourism may produce fortuitous changes in the standing of some individuals, including local elites—e.g. poor or hitherto unused land may suddenly acquire considerable value (e.g. Cohen 1982b:215; Clarke 1981:458; Noronha 1979:198). As a rule, however, the new tourist entrepreneurs do not come from the established local elites but are members of the urban middle classes (de Kadt 1979:48–49; Cohen 1983b).

The most general impact that tourism has on stratification is that it augments social disparities and hence widens the span of the local stratificational system (Cleverdon 1979:44; de Kadt 1979:48; Boissevain 1977:129; for an exception, see Stott 1978:81). This change reflects both the increased division of labor engendered by tourism and the unequal distribution of benefits that usually accompany it.

Tourism is not a particularly effective mechanism of social mobility: while some individuals may greatly benefit from it (Greenwood 1972:89; de Kadt 1979:49), rank and file employees of the industry have limited chances for

advancement, due to the peculiar employment structure; it has a broad base of unskilled and semiskilled workers and narrow upper echelons. Moreover, in poorly developed areas these echelons tend to be occupied by outsiders (Noronha 1977:55–57), to the detriment of local employees. Tourism does, however, encourage new economic activities in ancillary and complementary services and thus indirectly creates new opportunities for economic mobility among the locals (Cohen 1982b; Wahnschafft 1982:435–36).

The specific political consequences of tourism have only received scant attention (but see Matthews 1983). It appears that tourism gives rise to new kinds of political interests and leads to a pluralization of local power structures by creating new centers of power, new political offices, and new types of leaders who often compete with the traditional leadership. The frequent result is increased community conflict around novel issues (Nuñez 1963:351; Redclift 1973:7–8; Boissevain & Serracino-Inglott 1979:275–76).

The argument that tourism encourages deviance of various sorts has frequently been made (Nicholls 1976). While various kinds of tourism-oriented deviance such as theft, begging (Noronha 1979:193; Cohen 1983c), prostitution (e.g. Jones 1978; Cohen 1982d; Wahnschafft 1982:436–37), and fraud (e.g. Loeb 1977) have been reported, the role of tourism in the etiology of such activities appears to have been much exaggerated, particularly in the case of prostitution.

The impact of tourism on customs and the arts has been extensively examined (Graburn 1976c), but it can only be reviewed briefly here. Customs and the arts are frequently drawn into the economic domain or “commoditized” (Greenwood 1977) as resources to encourage tourism. While the fact that this occurs is commonly accepted, the question of their transformation and debasement through tourism is still hotly debated. “Commoditization” does not, in itself, necessarily change customs or the arts—indeed, in some instances it may conserve them in the interests of tourism (e.g. Aspelin 1977; Wilson 1979:230).

In most cases, customs and the arts have, in fact, undergone changes as they have been addressed to a new “external” public (Graburn 1976b:8; McKean 1976b:242–43) that does not share the cultural background, language, and values of the traditional, “internal” public. Dances and rituals have been shortened or embellished, and folk customs or arts altered, faked, and occasionally invented for the benefit of tourists (e.g. Boorstin 1964:108; Graburn 1976b:19–20).

Tourism has often been presented as a major debaser and destroyer of customs and the arts that leads to the emergence of a “phony-folk-culture” (Forster 1964:226) and to the mass production of cheap, artless souvenirs and fake “airport art” (Schadler 1979:147–48) adapted to tourists’ expectations (Boorstin 1964:106–7). While such phenomena are indeed quite widespread,

there are, however, other developments that the culture critics have overlooked. In particular, there are instances where tourism furthered the survival of an otherwise moribund folk art (e.g. Andronicou 1979:252–53; Boissevain 1977:532–34; Cohen 1983a) or stimulated the development of new arts or styles, occasionally of considerable artistic merit (e.g. Grabum 1976a, Cohen 1983a).

In conclusion, rather than looking at transformations engendered by tourism in customs and the arts as mere aberrations, it is more useful to approach them as another, albeit accelerated, stage in the continuous process of cultural change. It presently gives rise to a variety of “transitional arts” created for the tourist market and meriting attention on their own terms as genuinely new artistic creations.

CONCLUSION

Mainstream sociology has only recently discovered tourism as a field of systematic inquiry, but many sociologists still view it with suspicion or even disdain. While this may in part reflect the commonsense view of tourism as a frivolous, superficial activity unworthy of serious investigation, it also certainly reflects the fact that the study of tourism has not been well integrated into mainstream sociology. This situation has been only partly remedied by recent work. While a variety of often intriguing conceptual and theoretical approaches for studying the complex and manifold touristic phenomena have emerged, none has yet withstood rigorous empirical testing; while field-studies have proliferated, many lack an explicit, theoretical orientation and hence contribute little to theory building. It is hoped that this review helped to bring theory and empirical research closer together and to codify the field, as well as to further recognition of it as a legitimate and significant sociological specialty.

Literature Cited

- Andronicou, A. 1979. Tourism in Cyprus. See de Kadt 1979, pp. 237–64
- Aspelin, P. L. 1977. The anthropological analysis of tourism: Indirect tourism and the political economy of the Mamainde of Mato Grosso, Brazil. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(3):135–60
- Belisle, F. J., Hoy, D. R. 1980. The perceived impact of tourism by residents: A case study in Santa María, Colombia. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7(1):83–101
- Blakeway, M. 1980. The dilemmas of paradise. *PHP* Sept.: 73–84
- Bodio, L. 1899. Sul movimento dei forestieri in Italia e sul dinero chi vi spendono. *G. Econ.* 15:54–61
- Boissevain, J. 1977. Tourism and development in Malta. *Dev. & Change* 8(4):528–38
- Boissevain, J. 1979. The impact of tourism on a dependent island: Gozo, Malta. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(1):76–90
- Boissevain, J., Serracino-Inglott, P. 1979. Tourism in Malta. See de Kadt, 1979, pp. 265–84
- Boorstin, D. J. 1964. *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. NY: Harper & Row
- Britton, S. G. 1982. The political economy of tourism in the Third World. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(3):331–58
- Brodsky-Porges, E. 1981. The Grand Tour: Travel as an educational device, 1600–1800. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8(2):171–86

- Buck, R. C. 1978a. Boundary maintenance revisited—tourist experience in an Old Order Amish community. *Rural Sociol.* 43(2):221–34
- Buck, R. C. 1978b. From work to play: Some observations on a popular nostalgic theme. *J. Am. Cult.* 1(3):543–53
- Burkart, A. J., Medlik, S. 1974. *Tourism: Past, Present and Future*. London: Heinemann
- Butler, R. W. 1980. The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Can. Geogr.* 24(1):5–12
- Christaller, W. 1955. Beiträge zu einer Geographie des Fremdenverkehrs. *Erdkunde* 9(1):1–19
- Clarke, A. 1981. Coastal development in France: Tourism as a tool for regional development. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8(3):447–61
- Cleverdon, R. 1979. *The Economic and Social Impact of International Tourism in Developing Countries*. Spec. Rep. No. 6. London: Econ. Intell. Unit
- Cohen, E. 1972. Toward a sociology of international tourism. *Soc. Res.* 39(1):164–82
- Cohen, E. 1973. Nomads from affluence: Notes on the phenomenon of drifter-tourism. *Int. J. Comp. Sociol.* 14(1/2):89–103
- Cohen, E. 1974. Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification. *Sociol. Rev.* 22(4):527–55
- Cohen, E. 1979a. The impact of tourism on the Hill Tribes of northern Thailand. *Int. Asienforum* 10(1/2):5–38
- Cohen, E. 1979b. A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology* 13:179–201
- Cohen, E. 1979c. Rethinking the sociology of tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(1):18–35
- Cohen, E., ed. 1979d. Sociology of tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(1–2):18–194 (Spec. issue)
- Cohen, E. 1982a. Jungle guides in northern Thailand: The dynamics of a marginal occupational role. *Sociol. Rev.* 30(2):234–66
- Cohen, E. 1982b. Marginal paradises: Bungalow tourism on the islands of southern Thailand. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(2):189–228
- Cohen, E. 1982c. The Pacific Islands from utopian myth to consumer product: The disenchantment of paradise. *Cah. Tourisme, Ser. B* 27:1–34
- Cohen, E. 1982d. Thai girls and farang men: The edge of ambiguity. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(3):403–28
- Cohen, E. 1983a. The dynamics of commercialized arts: The Meo and Yao of northern Thailand. *J. Natl. Res. Council Thailand* 15(1):Pt. II, 1–34
- Cohen, E. 1983b. Insiders and outsiders: The dynamics of development of bungalow tourism on the islands of southern Thailand. *Hum. Organ.* 27(2):227–51
- Cohen, E. 1983c. Hill Tribe tourism. In *Highlanders of Thailand*, ed. W. Bhruksasri, J. McKinnon. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford Univ. Press
- Cohen, E. 1984. Pilgrimage and tourism: Convergence and divergence. In *Journeys to Sacred Places*, ed. E. A. Morinis. In press
- Cort, D. A., King, M. 1979. Some correlates of culture shock among American tourists in Africa. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 3(2):211–25
- Crompton, J. 1979. Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(4):408–24
- Dann, G. M. S. 1977. Anomie, ego enhancement and tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 4(2):184–94
- Dann, G. M. S. 1981. Tourism motivation: An appraisal. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8(2):187–219
- de Kadt, E. 1979. *Tourism—Passport to Development?* New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Doxey, G. V. 1976. A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: Methodology and research inferences. In *The Impact of Tourism*, Proc. 6th Ann. Conf. Travel Res. Assoc., San Diego, Calif., pp. 195–98
- Dress, G. 1979. *Wirtschafts- und sozialgeographische Aspekte des Tourismus in Entwicklungsländern*. München: Florentz
- Dumazdier, J. 1967. *Toward a Society of Leisure*. New York: Free
- Dunning, J., McQueen, M. 1982. Multinational corporations in the international hotel industry. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(1):69–90
- Edgerton, R. B. 1979. *Alone Together: Social Order on an Urban Beach*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Elkan, W. 1975. The relation between tourism and employment in Kenya and Tanzania. *J. Dev. Stud.* 11(2):123–30
- Evans, N. H. 1978. Tourism and cross-cultural communication. See Smith 1978a, pp. 41–53
- Farrell, B., ed. 1977. *The Social and Economic Impact of Tourism on Pacific Communities*. Santa Cruz: Cent. South Pac. Stud., Univ. Calif.
- Farrell, B. 1979. Tourism's human conflicts: Cases from the Pacific. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(2):122–36
- Finney, B. R., Watson, K. M. A., eds. 1975. *A New Kind of Sugar: Tourism in the Pacific*. Honolulu: East-West Cent.
- Forster, J. 1964. The sociological consequences of tourism. *Int. J. Comp. Sociol.* 5(2):217–27
- Fukunaga, L. 1975. A new sun in North Kohala: The socio-economic impact of tourism and resort development on a rural community in Hawaii. See Finney & Watson 1975, pp. 199–227
- Gamper, J. A. 1981. Tourism in Austria: A

- case study of the influence of tourism on ethnic relations. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8(3):432-46
- Gesheker, Ch. L. 1978. International tourism and African underdevelopment: Some reflections on Kenya. See Smith 1978b, pp. 57-88
- Gottlieb, A. 1982. Americans' vacations. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:165-87
- Graburn, N. H. H. 1976a. Eskimo art: The eastern Canadian Arctic. See Graburn 1976c, pp. 39-55
- Graburn, N. H. H. 1976b. Introduction: Arts of the Fourth World. See Graburn 1976c, pp. 1-32
- Graburn, N. H. H., ed. 1976c. *Ethnic and Tourist Arts: Cultural Expressions From the Fourth World*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
- Graburn, N. H. H. 1977. Tourism: The sacred journey. See Smith 1977c, pp. 17-32
- Graburn, N. H. H. 1983a. To pray, play and pay: The cultural structure of Japanese domestic tourism. *Cah. Tourisme, Ser. B* 25:1-89
- Graburn, N. H. H., ed. 1983b. Anthropology of tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 10(1):1-189. (Spec. issue)
- Gray, H. P. 1982. The economics of international tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(1):1-125. (Spec. issue)
- Greenwood, D. J. 1972. Tourism as an agent of change: A Spanish Basque case. *Ethnology* 11(1):80-91
- Greenwood, D. J. 1977. Culture by the pound: An anthropological perspective on tourism as cultural commoditization. See Smith 1977c, pp. 129-38
- Greenwood, D. J. 1982. Cultural "authenticity." *Cult. Survival Q.* 6(3):27-28
- Hermans, D. 1981. The encounter of agriculture and tourism: A Catalan case. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8(1):462-79
- Hiller, H. L. 1976. Escapism, penetration and response: Industrial tourism in the Caribbean. *Caribb. Stud.* 16(2):92-116
- Hiller, H. 1977. Industrialism, tourism, island nations and changing values. See Farrell 1977, pp. 115-21
- Hiller, H. L. 1979. Tourism: Development or dependence? In *The Restless Caribbean*, ed. R. Miller, W. M. Hill, pp. 51-61. New York: Praeger
- Høivik, T., Heiberg, T. 1980. Centre-periphery tourism and self-reliance. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 32(1):69-98
- Homburg, E. 1978. Reisen—zwischen Kritik und Analyse; zum Stand der Tourismusforschung. *Z. Kult.* 28(3):4-10
- Hovinen, G. R. 1982. Visitor cycles: Outlook for tourism in Lancaster county. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9:565-83
- International Union of Official Travel Organizations. (IUOTO). 1963. *The United Nations' Conference on International Travel and Tourism*. Geneva: IUOTO
- Jenkins, C. L. 1982. The effects of scale in tourism projects in developing countries. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(2):229-49
- Joerges, B., Karsten, D. 1978. Tourismus und Kulturwandel. *Z. Kult.* 28(3):4-10
- Jones, D. R. W. 1978. *Prostitution and Tourism*. Presented at PEACESAT Conf. Impact Tourism Dev. Pac. Sess. 4, April 19, 1978. Suva: Univ. South Pac. Ext. Serv. (Mimeo)
- Jordan, J. W. 1980. The summer people and the natives: Some effects of tourism in a Vermont vacation village. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7(1):34-55
- Kaufmann, W. F. III. 1983. Tourism in the twenty-first century. *Sci. Dig.* 91(4):52-64
- Kent, N. 1975. A new kind of sugar. See Finney & Watson 1975, pp. 169-98
- Knebel, H. J. 1960. *Soziologische Strukturwandlungen im modernen Tourismus*. Stuttgart: Enke
- Knox, J. M. 1978. *Resident-visitor interaction: A review of the literature and general policy alternatives*. See Jones 1978
- Lanfant, M. F. 1980. Introduction: Tourism in the process of internationalization. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 32(1):14-43
- Laurent, A. 1973. *Libérer les vacances?* Paris: Seuil
- Leach, J. W. 1973. Making the best of tourism: The Trobriand case. In *Priorities in Melanesian Development*, ed. R. J. May, pp. 357-61. Canberra: Aust. Natl. Univ.
- Leiper, N. 1979. The framework of tourism: Towards a definition of tourism, tourist and the tourist industry. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(4):390-407
- Lengyel, P., ed. 1980. The anatomy of tourism. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 32(1):1-150 (Spec. issue)
- Loeb, L. D. 1977. Creating antiques for fun and profit: Encounters between Iranian Jewish merchants and touring correligionists. See Smith 1977c, pp. 185-92
- MacCannell, D. 1973. Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *Am. J. Sociol.* 79(3):589-603
- MacCannell, D. 1976. *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken
- Manning, F. E. 1979. Tourism and Bermuda's black clubs: A case of cultural revitalization. See de Kadt 1979, pp. 157-76
- Mansur, F. 1972. *Bodrum: A Town in the Aegean*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill
- Matthews, H. G. 1978. *International Tourism—A Political and Social Analysis*. Cambridge, Mass: Schenkman
- Matthews, H., ed. 1983. Political Science and Tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 10(3) (Spec. issue)

- McKean, Ph. F. 1976a. Interaction between tourists and Balinese: An anthropological analysis of partial equivalence structures. *Majalah Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Indones.* 3:135-46
- McKean, Ph. F. 1976b. Tourism, culture change and culture conservation in Bali. In *Changing Identities in Modern Southeast Asia*, ed. D. J. Banks, pp. 237-48. The Hague: Mouton
- Mitford, N. 1959. The tourist. *Encounter* 13(4):3-7
- Myers, P. B., Moncrief, L. W. 1978. Differential leisure travel decision-making between spouses. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5(1):157-65
- Nash, D. 1977. Tourism as a form of imperialism. See Smith 1977c, pp. 33-47
- Nash, D. 1979. The rise and fall of an aristocratic tourist culture—Nice, 1763-1936. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(1):61-75
- Nash, D. 1981. Tourism as an anthropological subject. *Curr. Anthropol.* 22(5):461-81
- Nettekoven, L. 1979. Mechanisms of inter-cultural interaction. See de Kadt 1979, pp. 135-45
- Newman, B. 1973. Holidays and social class. In *Leisure and Society in Britain*, ed. M. A. Smith et al., pp. 230-40. London: Allen Lane
- Nicholls, L. L. 1976. Tourism and crime. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 3:176-82
- Nieto Piñeroba, J. A. 1977. Turistas y nativos: el caso de Formentera. *Rev. Esp. Opin. Pública* 47:147-67
- Noronha, R. 1977. Social and cultural dimensions of tourism: A review of the literature in English. Washington DC: World Bank (Draft)
- Noronha, R. 1979. Paradise reviewed: Tourism in Bali. See de Kadt 1979, pp. 177-204
- Norval, A. J. 1936. *The Tourist Industry: A National and International Survey*. London: Pitman
- Núñez, Th. A. 1963. Tourism, tradition and acculturation: *Weekendismo* in a Mexican village. *Ethnology* 2(3):347-52
- Ogilvie, F. W. 1933. *The Tourist Movement: An Economic Study*. London: Staples
- Papson, S. 1981. Spuriousness and tourism: Politics of two Canadian provincial governments. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 8(2):220-35
- Pearce, D. G. 1978. Demographic variations in international tourism. *Rev. Tourisme* 33(1):4-9
- Pearce, D. G. 1980. Tourism and regional development: A genetic approach. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7(1):69-82
- Pearce, J. A. 1980. Host community acceptance of foreign tourists: Strategic considerations. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7(2):224-33
- Pearce, P. L. 1981. "Environmental shock": A study of tourists' reactions to two tropical islands. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 11(3):268-80
- Pearce, P. L. 1982. *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behaviour*. New York: Pergamon
- Peck, J. G., Lepie, A. Sh. 1977. Tourism and development in three North Carolina towns. See Smith 1977c, pp. 159-72
- Pérez, L. A. 1973. Aspects of underdevelopment: Tourism in the West Indies. *Sci. & Soc.* 37(4):473-80
- Pi-Sunyer, O. 1977. Through native eyes: Tourists and tourism in a Catalan maritime community. See Smith 1977c, pp. 149-55
- Pizam, A., Neumann, Y., Reichel, A. 1978. Dimensions of tourist satisfaction with a destination area. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5(3):314-22
- Preau, P. 1982. Tourisme et urbanisation en montagne: le cas de la Savoie. *Rev. Géogr. Alp.* 70(1/2):137-51
- Rambaud, P. 1967. Tourisme et urbanisation des campagnes. *Sociol. Rur.* 7:311-34
- Redclift, M. 1973. The effects of socio-economic changes in a Spanish Pueblo on community cohesion. *Sociol. Rur.* 13(1):1-14
- Reich, R. J. 1980. The development of Antarctic tourism. *Polar Rec.* 20(126):203-14
- Reynoso y Valle, A., de Regt, J. P. 1979. Growing pains: Planned tourism development in Ixtapa-Zihuatanejo. See de Kadt 1979, pp. 111-34
- Rodenburg, E. E. 1980. The effects of scale in economic development: Tourism in Bali. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7(2):177-96
- Schadler, K. F. 1979. African arts and crafts in a world of changing values. See de Kadt 1979, pp. 146-56
- Scheuch, E. K. 1981. Tourismus. In *Die Psychologie des 20. Jahrhunderts*, 13:1089-114 München: Kindler
- Schmidt, C. J. 1979. The guided tour: Insulated adventure. *Urb. Life* 7(4):441-67
- Schudson, M. S. 1979. On tourism and modern culture. *Am. J. Sociol.* 84(5):1249-58
- Shamir, B. 1978. Between bureaucracy and hospitality—Some organizational characteristics of hotels. *J. Mgmt. Stud.* 15(3):285-307
- Smith, V. L. 1977a. Eskimo tourism: Micro-models and marginal man. See Smith 1977c, pp. 51-70
- Smith, V. L. 1977b. Introduction. See V. L. Smith 1977c, pp. 1-14
- Smith, V. L., ed. 1977c. *Hosts and Guests*. Philadelphia: Univ. Pa. Press
- Smith, V. L., ed. 1978a. *Tourism and Behavior. Studies in Third World Societies, No. 5*. Williamsburg, Va: Dep. Anthropol., Coll. William & Mary
- Smith, V. L. ed. 1978b. *Tourism and Economic Change. Studies in Third World Societies, No. 6*. Williamsburg, Va: Dep. Anthropol., Coll. William & Mary

- Smith, V. L. 1979. Women: The taste makers in tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 6(1):49-60
- Smith, V. L., ed. 1980. Tourism and development: Anthropological perspectives. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7(1):11-119 (Spec. issue)
- Stansfield, C. 1978. Atlantic City and the resort cycle. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5(2):238-51
- Stoffle, R. W., Last, C. A., Evans, M. J. 1979. Reservation-based tourism: Implications of tourist attitudes for Native American economic development. *Hum. Organ.* 38(3):300-6
- Stott, M. A. 1978. Tourism in Mykonos: Some social and cultural responses. *Mediterr. Stud.* 1(2):72-90
- Stringer, P., ed. 1984. Social psychology and tourism. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 11(1) (Spec. issue)
- Sutton, W. A. 1967. Travel and understanding: Notes on the social structure of touring. *Int. J. Comp. Sociol.* 8(2):218-23
- Swain, M. B. 1977. Cuna women and ethnic tourism: A way to persist and an avenue to change. See Smith 1977c, pp. 71-82
- Taylor, A. E. 1932. "Tourism"—The business of organized hospitality. *Commer. Rep.* 35:188-90
- ten Have, P. 1974. The counter culture on the march: A field study of youth tourists in Amsterdam. *Mens Maatsch.* 49(3):297-315
- Tourismus und Kulturwandel. 1978. Tourismus und Kulturwandel. *Z. Kult.* 28(3):1-119 (Spec. issue)
- Turner, L., Ash, J. 1975. *The Golden Hordes: International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery*. London: Constable
- UNESCO. 1976. The effects of tourism on socio-cultural values. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 4(2):78-105
- Urbanowicz, Ch. F. 1977. Tourism in Tonga: Troubled times. See Smith 1977c, pp. 83-92
- van den Berghe, P. 1980. Tourism as ethnic relations: A case study of Cuzco, Peru. *Ethn. Racial Stud.* 3(4):375-92
- van den Berghe, P., Keyes, Ch. F., eds. 1984. Tourism and ethnicity. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 11(3) In press (Spec. issue)
- Varley, R. C. G. 1978. *Tourism in Fiji: Some Economic and Social Problems*, Bangor Occas. Pap. Econ. No. 1. Bangor: Univ. Wales
- Vogt, J. W. 1976. Wandering: Youth and travel behavior. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 4(1):25-41
- von Wiese, L. 1930. Fremdenverkehr als zwischenmenschliche Beziehung. *Arch. Fremdenverkehr* 1(1)
- Wagner, U. 1977. Out of time and place: Mass tourism and charter trips. *Ethnos* 42(1/2):38-52
- Wahnschafft, R. 1982. Formal and informal tourism sectors: A case study of Pattaya, Thailand. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 9(3):429-52
- Wall, G., Ali, J. M. 1977. The impact of tourism in Trinidad and Tobago. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 5:43-49
- Waters, S. R. 1966. The American tourist. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 368:109-18
- Williams, A. V., Zelinsky, W. 1970. Some patterns in international tourist flows. *Econ. Geogr.* 46(4):549-67
- Wilson, D. 1979. The early effects of tourism on the Seychelles. See de Kadt 1979, pp. 205-36
- Wood, R. E. 1979. Tourism and underdevelopment in Southeast Asia. *J. Contemp. Asia* 8(4):274-87
- Wood, R. E. 1981. The economics of tourism. *Southeast Asia Chron.* 78:2-9
- World Tourism Trends. 1982. World tourism trends in 1981. *Int. Tourism Q.* 1:1
- Young, G. 1973. *Tourism—Blessing or Blight?* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin