

CHAPTER TWO

SOCIOLOGY, TOUR GUIDES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The production and consumption of tourism are fundamentally 'geographical' processes. At their heart are constructions of and relationships with places and spaces. These places include destinations, which are differentiated through processes of social incorporation within economies of taste (Connell 1993). They also include the spaces of mobility that construct travel to these destinations, which are likewise resources for both self-formation and economic valuation (Curtis and Pajaczkowska 1994). In turn, these places and spaces operate as settings for the performances of both producers and consumers, helping to establish the precise character of a tourism product and its performance (Crang 1997: 143).

This thesis has developed an independent theory of ecotourism and tour guides by utilising the theories and literatures from four different areas: the sociology of tourism; tourism and the environment; tour guides; and emotional labour. Each of these literatures contributes to the understanding and analysis of my research that examines the emerging occupation of the ecotour guide and the experience provided by the guide for the tourists. Currently, it is evident that ecotourism forms an exclusive 'sector' of the tourist industry and I have been mindful of this when examining the literature.

The sociology of tourism has long recognised the notion of authenticity as grounded in tourist experience (MacCannell 1976). According to this perspective, authenticity is perceived to be a 'connection between truth, intimacy and sharing life behind the scenes' (MacCannell 1976: 95). Spooner (1986) believes that '[a]uthenticity is a conceptualisation of elusive, inadequately defined, other cultural, socially ordered genuineness' (1986: 225). Cohen (1988b) suggests that "'[a]uthenticity" is an eminently modern value ... whose emergence is closely related to the impact of modernity upon the unity of social existence' (1988b: 373-374).

The sociology of tourism literature also recognises that the occupation of tour guide is a different form of employment (Cohen 1985: 6). The literature pertaining to tour guides has identified areas of interest and expansion relevant to the emergence of a 'new' tour guide occupation. Previously, the work of the tour guide has been considered a 'role' in the service of tourists (Cohen 1985, 1982; Crick 1992; Gurung, Simmons and Devlin 1996). However, I would argue that the evolving form of the tour guide is developing into an independent service provision orientation in the competitive workplace of an experience economy (Hochschild 1983; Leidner 1999, 1993; Smith 1992; Tolich 1993). This is different from the 'role' representation where guides were perceived as fulfilling the 'function' of the

tour leader. This new perspective on tour guides has been used extensively in this dissertation.

The theory of emotional labour underpins my examination of guide performance as interactive service work, where direct interaction with customers or tourists is the primary function of the worker. Emotional labour can be defined as a particular type of service employment, where employers often endeavour to manage the emotions of their workers, while the workers endeavour to control the emotional responses of clients (Leidner 1999). Both these theories inform the subsequent analysis of guides as members of both the service industry and the experience economy because they provide the essential background information to examine the tour guides' production and delivery of the ecotourism experience to their tourist groups.

Finally, the literature on tourism and the environment discusses preservation and protection of the 'fragile environment' by the use of sustainable tourism practices, an idea which is employed to analyse guided tours throughout the thesis, and tourism business management practices in Chapter Seven.

Sociology and Tourism

In the latter half of the twentieth century, many sociologists (see Apostolopoulos 1993, 1995a, 1995b; Boorstin 1992; Britton 1982; Cohen 1972, 1974, 1979a, 1979b, 1984, 1988a, 1988b; Dann 1977, 1981; Dann and Cohen 1991, de Kadt 1979; Forster 1964; Graburn 1989; Karch and Dann 1981; Lanfant 1980; MacCannell 1976, 1992; Machlis and Burch 1983; Pearce 1982; Turner and Ash 1976; van den Berghe 1992; Young 1973) were fascinated by the expansion of tourism as both a profitable and cultural experience as well as by its powerful impact on both industrialised and developing countries. While their research has used various sociological theories and perspectives,¹ most studies have been somewhat detached from a substantive theoretical investigation. As a result, no one sociological perspective can declare an influence in the understanding of tourism. Like all vibrant components of intellectual enterprise, the sociology of tourism is in a state of constant change, and in search of 'the' overarching theory of tourism (Dann and Cohen 1991) can be a side distraction.

Overall, my central theme is that tourism is part of the progression of commodification intrinsic to contemporary capitalism. Tourism is therefore

¹ See MacCannell (1976) and Turner and Ash (1976) for a conflict perspective, Mayo and Jarvis (1981) for a functionalist perspective, Dann (1977) for a Weberian perspective, Cohen (1979b) for a phenomenological perspective, McHugh et al. (1974) for an ethnomethodological perspective, Dann (1989) for a symbolic interactionist perspective, and Apostolopoulos (1993) for a world system/dependency perspective (Apostolopoulos 1996).

best theorised as a global process of commodification and consumption which entails the movement of capital, cultures, images and people (Appadurai 1990; Clifford 1997; Frow 1997; Lanfant et al. 1995; Meethan 2001).

Development of the service sector in tourism is as important as the focus on 'host-guest' (Smith 1978) interaction. Whether or not tourism is considered or treated as a 'commercialised hospitality', 'democratised travel', 'modern leisure activity', 'modern variety of the traditional pilgrimage', 'expression of basic cultural themes', 'acculturative process', a 'type of ethnic relations', or a 'form of neo-colonialism' (Cohen 1984), it is still a multifaceted sociocultural, political and economic phenomenon that requires orderly sociological investigation (Apostolopoulos 1996).

In the English-speaking world, two contrasting positions on tourism emerged in the late 1950s and 1960s. One view depicted the tourist as a cultural dope controlled by the establishment (Boorstin 1964). The other position, including writers like Forster (1964), endeavoured to detail the phenomenon both empirically and objectively (Dann and Cohen 1996).

The study of tourism as a sociological field of inquiry rather than as a marginal topic for sociological investigation emerged in the 1970s with

Cohen's (1972) essay of tourist taxonomy and MacCannell's (1973) original theoretical synthesis (Cohen 1996). In addition, Smith's (1978) tourist types are founded on a pattern of the number of tourists and their acclimatisation to local norms, while Cohen's (1972) classification of tourists' roles is built on the scope of the tourists' contact with the peculiarities of the host environment as against their shelter within the 'environmental bubble' of their home environment that is supplied by the touristic establishment. Four types of tourists - the organised and the individual mass tourist, the explorer and the drifter are distinguished (Cohen 1972). Much of the recent work on tourism is based on Smith's or Cohen's important early work. Most of the literature refers at least implicitly to the mass tourist (Boorstin 1964: 77-117; MacCannell 1976), often mistakenly assuming that the mass tourist represents all tourists. Evans is one of the few who deals expressly with the 'explorer' who, unlike the mass tourist seeks adventure and experience 'off the beaten track' (1978: 48-50). Drifters or 'travellers' have been studied closely (Cohen 1973; Cohen 1982b), and only a few studies have explicitly compared different types of tourists and their impact on their destinations (Cohen 1982b; Evans 1978: 48-51).

The early work of Cohen (1972, 1974) perceives the tourist as a traveller and develops a polarity of typologies including familiarity and strangeness; this continuum varies in scope from the traditional type of travel of mass tourists to the alternative mode of the voyager or traveller.

Cohen rejects the concept of the mass tourist because, despite popular belief, all tourists are not identical and have different attitudes, behaviour and motivation (Dann and Cohen 1996).

However, MacCannell (1973, 1976) initiated a more sociologically insightful and productive approach to the field. He, more than other theorists, sought to refute those representing the tourist as a 'superficial nitwit' by presenting tourism in the context of a quest for authenticity (Dann and Cohen 1996).

Cohen (1984) also argued that the sociology of tourism could be categorised into four key areas: the tourists, interactions between tourists and hosts, the tourism structure and the effects of tourism. Also, while there were many diverse empirical studies, these frequently lacked theoretical insight and employed either sociographic data of little consequence or unsupported theoretical speculation (Dann and Cohen 1996).

MacCannell believes that tourism is the modern equivalent of a religious pilgrimage: the two are similar because 'both are quests for authentic experiences' (1973: 593). He contends that modern peoples' quest for authenticity is comparable to the 'concern for the sacred in primitive society' (MacCannell 1973: 590), and is therefore related to the religious

pursuit of fundamental reality (Cohen 1996). When this notion is combined with the 'front stage-back stage' dichotomy of Goffman (1959), tourists are portrayed as attempting to penetrate the spurious fronts of staged settings in tourism so as to gain entry to the authentic back region. That they do not gain entry to the 'real' back stage areas of tourism is not connected to the tourists' superficiality (Boorstin 1964) but to the contrived structural characteristics of touristic space, which are frequently misunderstood as the authentic article which leads to a false touristic consciousness (Dann and Cohen 1996).

Because of the superficiality and inauthenticity of contemporary life and the alienation of modern humankind, 'reality and authenticity are thought to be elsewhere: in the other historical periods and other cultures, in purer, simpler life-styles' (MacCannell 1976: 3). The pursuit of authenticity therefore induces modern individuals to become tourists. MacCannell combines this seminal idea within another one – specifically that structurally, *'sightseeing is a ritual performed to the differentiations of society'* (MacCannell 1976: 13, italics in original). The differentiations are symbolised in the diversity of attractions, which are the contemporary counterpart of the undifferentiated totemic symbols of so-called undeveloped societies. Even though attractions are potential representations of authenticity, not all of them are equally authentic (Schudson 1979: 1251). In reality, the authenticity of the attraction is often staged by the hosts; who shrewdly undermine the

tourist's venture for 'the genuine'. Caught in a staged 'tourist space' from which they cannot escape, modern mass tourists are prevented access to the back regions of the host society where legitimate authenticity can be found. Instead they are shown a 'false back' presented as an authentic experience. The unstated inference is that tourism is actually a futile pursuit (Cohen 1996).

MacCannell (1976) draws heavily on Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class* ([1899] 1965). Yet, despite this indebtedness, there is almost no similarity between their findings. MacCannell adopts Veblen's notion that leisure mirrors social structure. However, MacCannell bases his analysis of leisure on the selection of elements from tourism, whereas Veblen grounds his analysis in the class structure and highlights the uneven distribution of work in society and the status mechanisms of leisure; for example, the way leisure is consumed conspicuously as a representation of superior social positioning (MacCannell 1976).

MacCannell (1976) also draws on Marxist concepts of social class relations in his analysis of commodity value, as new types of commodities emerge in the contemporary world, and as the basic nature of the commodity changes (for example, from a pair of trousers to a structured vacation; from paid work to non-work) (MacCannell 1976).

Like Boorstin (1964: 77-117) MacCannell presents the tourist as a single character type, whereas Cohen suggests that tourists vary considerably from one another in their purpose (Cohen 1979b), styles of travel and behaviour. Numerous criteria have been proposed to categorise tourists and tourism (see Cohen 1972; Smith 1978).

The sense of modern social fragmentation positioned at the start of *The Tourist* (MacCannell 1976) appears in a greater intensity in *Empty Meeting Grounds* (MacCannell 1992), 'the starting point [of which] is [the] non-controversial assumption that the cultures of the world have been radically displaced and fundamentally and forever altered by the movements of peoples' (MacCannell 1992: 3). MacCannell suggests that this social dislocation (and the activities of homeless people, migrants, refugees and tourists which communicate it) produces two different types of 'displaced thought'. The first type of displaced thought uses the signs and artifacts of cultural difference and national boundaries creatively in an ongoing process of formulation, reformulation and 'hybridisation' of culture in a contemporary world; we live on a planet where the 'heroes of these [cultural] diasporas' are travelling 'bricoleurs' (MacCannell 1992: 4). The second type of displaced thought 'consumes' cultures (in the style, for example, of tourist brochures which aim to construct culture as 'consumable'

by tourists). At the root of this consumable process lies the subordination of hosts to tourism, which is connected to the reconstruction of the traditional lives of the hosts displaced by the advent of 'globalisation' Selwyn 1996: 2).

MacCannell's work has been influential, and together with Urry, they have positioned the problem of tourism directly in the mainstream of the sociological study of contemporary society. Significantly, MacCannell's contributions have assisted generally to reaffirm the study of tourism by persuading others to take tourists' ambitions and behaviour seriously (Cohen 1988a; Dann and Cohen 1996).

Critical sociological theories of tourism have benefitted from the profound and innovative work of Urry's (1990), *The Tourist Gaze*, which explores the popularity of the beach holiday and where he considers the importance of the Foucauldian 'gaze' in tourism. The term 'gaze' has permeated tourism literature well into the present.

Furthermore, the holiday and the tradition of tourism have become a leitmotif for contemporary cultural change and the reconfiguration of contemporary identities (Lash and Urry 1994). According to Urry (1990), the structure of modern tourism mirrors a changing cultural landscape; as museums represent historical events only to mirror present day concerns and

values. Urry suggests that comparatively consistent, innovative and 'auratic' historical descriptions, generally based on a version of national history, acknowledge explanations and representations which are more diverse, postmodernist, vernacular and parochial (Selwyn 1996). In this intellectual setting, a broader diversity of social groups may be able to represent 'their' histories. Concisely, a particular national history, 'scientifically' represented, accommodates numerous other histories, derived from locality, class, gender, ethnicity, and so forth, and is represented in numerous forms (Selwyn 1996).

Urry's (1990) text has been important in incorporating Foucauldian insights into the sociology of tourism. However, although his assertion that there is no simple historical authenticity is unquestionably correct, the notion that history is socially constructed, just like heritage, is deeply problematic (Selwyn 1996).

Furthermore, in a later work, Urry (1995) reconsiders the movement of tourists in *Consuming Places* as central to the very idea of modernity. Mobility is 'responsible for altering how people experience the modern world, changing both their forms of subjectivity and sociability and their aesthetic appreciation of nature, landscapes, townscapes and other societies' (1995: 144).

The aim of the sociology of tourism, following MacCannell and Urry, has been to develop a general theory of tourism. This had led to a split between the general sociological theory of tourism and the more modest approach to tourism, taken up by Cohen where he suggests keeping theory close to data by being both comparative and emic. MacCannell's general theoretical proposition is that tourists search for structures from which they have been alienated by every day life in the modern world. This theory provides the theoretical basis for the sociology of tourism and has been widely employed despite opposition from many sectors (Selwyn 1996).

The literature on tourism does not delineate a clear separation between tourism and leisure (Cohen 1995). Some researchers suggest that the 'sociology of tourism' should be situated within the 'sociology of leisure'. This is significant because leisure has been interpreted as the opposite, or converse to work. Therefore, tourism generally is at odds with work, as it is the time to recuperate from work and re-energise oneself in order to be able to engage in work and contribute to the consumption process. However, tourism and leisure are also part of the process of consumption. Undeniably, the definition of a tourist as an individual 'at leisure' who travels (Nash 1981) is attractive for its easiness. Yet, this definition is too limited and imprecise to encapsulate the many varied categories evidenced by travellers. Furthermore, according to other researchers, the term 'leisure' is itself

problematic, because it has been defined differently over time according to shifting ideological, political and social conditions (Dann and Cohen 1996).

Sociology of tourism is a vibrant area of investigation. It continues to develop and grow as an area of significant study. However, tourism's vibrance, according to MacCannell and Urry, may be too grandiose for the modest position of Cohen. The sociology of tourism literature has also been influenced by other disciplines such as psychology and tourism. The debate between agency and structure, or the individual and the organisational role of tourism is strongly evident in the literature. This underlines the significance of the search for an overarching sociological theory of tourism itself.

Tourism and the Environment

The relationship between tourism and the environment has undergone five stages since the 1950s and these stages have been marked by changes in terminology and specialised vocabulary. Currently in this decade, there is a further shift underway with regard to the relationship between tourism and the environment. Originally, the relationship was perceived as one of co-existence (Zierer 1952). But the advent of mass tourism in the 1960s placed growing pressure on natural areas. Commercial imperatives were at odds

with the growing environmental awareness and concern of the early 1970s (Akoglu 1971; Cohen 1978; OECD 1980; Mathieson and Wall 1982).

The first phase of the relationship between tourism and the environment began fifty years ago, when the established view was that tourism made few impacts on the natural environment. 'A notable characteristic of the tourist industry and recreation industry is that it does not, or should not, lead to the destruction of natural resources' (Zierer 1952: 463). Yet, tourism's professional association, the International Union of Official Travel Organisations (IUOTO), the predecessor of the World Travel Organisation (WTO), did understand the likelihood of adverse impacts. In 1954, the IUOTO's General Assembly insisted on a component of tourist heritage to safeguard tourism 'capital', or resources, from potentially unfavourable physical and social consequences (Dowling 1992).

The second phase of the relationship between tourism and the environment was the introduction of mass tourism in the 1960s, which generated an excess of research on the appraisal of tourism. The IUOTO confirmed through a variety of surveys, that natural tourism resources were the main attraction for tourists, even in countries with an exceptional cultural heritage. These surveys helped to initiate the first studies on the 'ecological impact' of tourism. In turn, these studies persuaded the IUOTO of the

necessity for an incorporated approach to tourism development (Dowling 1992).

Throughout the 1960s, escalating public awareness of the environment increased, as did mass tourism and it was inevitable that the clash would provoke public apprehension. Initial concerns for an extensive global environmental awareness had been made by Carson in her monograph *Silent Spring* (1962), and by Hardin in his seminal work 'The Tragedy of the Commons' (1969). These works were swiftly followed by key assertions of worldwide environmental problems in *Ecoscience: Population, Resources and Environment* (Ehrlich, Ehrlich and Holdren 1970), and *The Environmental Revolution* (Nicholson 1970).

In the 1970s, the third phase of the relationship between tourism and the environment came into play. Some in the tourist industry, conscious of the increase in public awareness, sought to prevent criticism by entering into discussion. For instance, a review article in the *Tourist Review*, entitled 'Tourism and the Problem of Environment', was presented by Akoglu (Akoglu 1971). At the same time, the International Union of Official Travel Organisations (IUOTO) implemented an environmental tourist strategy. Integral to it was the suggestion that, at the nationwide level, countries should create a register of natural tourist resources. Implicit in the policy

statement was the notion of classification or zoning, where regions with an exceptionally vulnerable or delicate environment would be developed only on a small scale, if possible. Another significant characteristic of the tourist environmental policy was the creation of guidelines for development of new tourist resorts. The IUOTO recommended that environmental reflections be included in the administration of the design of any new tourist development so that structures merged with their environs and any unfavourable environmental effects were limited (Dowling 1992). These policies were reported at the United Nations *Conference on the Human Environment* at Stockholm in 1972. This meeting proved significant, as it was there that the new term 'ecodevelopment strategy' originated, which recommended that economic development should occur only if it was related to environmental protection. An outcome of this approach was the notion that any ensuing tourism-environment development should be totally harmonious with local values and culture. The World Bank, noted for financing large dams and other structures that affect the environment, nevertheless felt it necessary to initiate a study concerning standards of facilities for both the visitor and local population (Seth 1985).

During the 1970s, different ideas on the association between tourism and the environment proliferated, but were mainly divided between being in favour of, or in opposition to, tourism. Some writers pointed out that

tourism offered the motivation for conservation through the creation of national parks (Myers 1972), heritage values (Greenwood 1972) and natural and cultural resources (Agarwal and Nangia 1974; Dower 1974). Others maintained that tourism generated unsatisfactory expenditures as a result of the pollution (Goldsmith 1974; Young 1973) and effects on fauna (Crittendon 1975; Mountfort 1975) or flora (Liddle 1975; McCabe 1979). So, the divide and the debate between tourism that maintains the environment and tourism that utilises the environment began.

But, it was two tourism experts who supplied the connection between tourism and the natural environment. Haulot, the Commissioner General of Tourism in Belgium, and Krippendorf, the Director of the Swiss Tourism Association, both advocated tourism-environment integration (Haulot 1974; Krippendorf 1975). Their monographs were the first on the topic of tourism and the environment, and after an extensive survey of tourism's consequences on the environment, they decided that the two must be maintained in equilibrium (Dowling 1992).

A landmark year in the tourism-environment debate was 1976. Dr Gerardo Budowski, the Director General of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), examined the relationship between the promotion of tourism and the advocacy of nature

conservation (Budowski 1976). He argued for recognition that the notion of tourism is partly or totally based on values derived from nature and its resources, and asserted that the affiliation could be one of conflict, co-existence or symbiosis. Budowski proposed that the elements of conflict and co-existence are in symbiosis when each draws benefits from the other. In other words, natural qualities are preserved whilst tourism development is accomplished. Budowski maintained that this attitude promotes tourism-environment integration (Dowling 1992).

Nevertheless, Budowski identified that the tourism-environment relationship at that time was frequently one of conflict rather than co-existence. His perspective was one of an emerging environmental consciousness, and challenged both conservationists and tourism developers to modify their attitudes and work towards amalgamation, which he proposed would make possible a symbiotic relationship. Budowski suggested that if this technique were followed, then tourism and conservation would profit jointly. He said, 'tourism helps by lending support to those conservation programs which will develop educational, scientific and recreational resources with the objective that they in turn will attract more and different kinds of tourists' (Budowski 1976: 29).

For example, the overpopulated Mediterranean, which for centuries has had a conflict between tourists and the fragile coastal environment, underwent, at least at public policy level, the necessary adoption of the symbiotic approach (Tangi 1971). To safeguard and protect the region's environmental value the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) supported the 'Mediterranean Action Plan' and the 'Regional Seas Program'. These programs established various tourism development plans to minimise the unfavourable impacts of mass tourism. These tactics were expressed as alternative development strategies and included aspects of space, time and education (Dowling 1992).

In the latter part of the 1970s an effort was made to systematically calculate the environmental impacts of tourism (Cohen 1978). The environment was depicted as the 'physical environment' with both natural and cultural elements and effects categorised as either positive or negative. The features of the environmental impacts of tourists were expressed as being determined by the concentration of tourist locality use, the hardness of the ecosystem, the temporal view of the developers and the transformational quality of touristic developments. A progressive phase was planned for natural locations where the initial tourist destinations had become environmentally ruined through exhaustive use. Finally, Cohen (1978) stated that the tourism-environment affiliation could be as a duality, either as

shielding the environment 'for' tourism, or 'from' tourism. He surmised that the second procedure was especially important, particularly in developing countries (Dowling 1992).

Also during 1978, the American Conservation Foundation compiled a set of case studies of tourism in natural regions in eight developed countries (Booselman 1978). The compilation outlined many of the problems connected to tourism impacts on natural regions, and concluded that tourism can be advantageous if it makes the tourist more conscious of the special merits of the location. At the same time as Booselman and Cohen were highlighting the potential environmental risks caused by tourism, Gunn (1978) was suggesting an association between tourism and the environment. Although Gunn followed Budowski's position that the tourism-environment bond had developed from co-existence by way of conflict to symbiosis, he also underlined their synergistic possibilities. To examine these, Gunn supported the establishment of a worldwide association of tourism, recreation and conservation (Dowling 1992).

In the 1970s, the potential conflicts of tourism and the natural environment were recognised together with an escalation of interest in the relationship between tourism and the cultural and social environment. Research was focused on the host, the tourist and the host-tourist

relationship (Turner and Ash 1975; Smith 1977; de Kadt 1979). Moreover, this decade brought both an understanding that tourism development, which was economically based, could be moderated and the idea that social impacts were a part of the process, and that these could be perceived as either negative (Thomason, Crompton and Van Kemp 1979) or positive (Cohen 1979).

The beginning of the 1980s saw a strengthened interest in conservation and tourism concerns with regard to the relationship between tourism and the environment. That year, the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) signed a formal agreement on tourism and the environment. The 'Manila Declaration on World Tourism' was created in September at the World Tourism Conference in the Philippines. In the same year, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) released the results from three years of research by experts on tourism and the environment (OECD 1980). The publication reviewed the circumstances at that time, where tourism and the environment were in conflict because of the unfavourable environmental effects caused by tourism. It predicted that tourism would absorb increasingly more people and would escalate to become a mass phenomenon whose unrestrained expansion would be seriously detrimental to the environment (OECD 1980: 41).

At the same time as these environmental initiatives were being made by tourism (WTO) and development (OECD), the world's foremost environmental groups (the IUCN), UNEP and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF; later to be known as the World Wide Fund for Nature), joined forces to submit a worldwide conservation proposal - 'The World Conservation Strategy' (IUCN 1980). The plan maintained that progress could only be continued by safeguarding the existing resources on which it relied, and by maintaining a constructive amalgamation of development and conservation. Living-resource protection was identified as explicitly related to flora, fauna and micro-organisms, and those non-living components of the environment on which they rely. It was suggested that living resources have a valuable property that differentiates them from non-living resources: that they are able to regenerate if conserved and disintegrate if not. The same contention was employed with water, soil and atmospheric resources. The strategy used the previous concept of ecodevelopment, which connected environment and development, and added the further idea of a combination of the two with the purpose of the earth sustaining humankind in the future. This strategy was to form the future trend of conservation for the rest of the decade and achieved growing significance when, during the same year, the Brandt Commission Report on North-South relations stated that expansion

must incorporate the guardianship of the environment (Brandt Commission 1980).

However, worldwide attempts were being made to realise tourism-environment harmony. In Nepal the Sagarmatha (Mount Everest) National Park was set up mainly to improve the unfavourable environmental impacts of backpacking tourists. One of its key aims was to encourage tourist and visitor use appropriate to the environment and compatible with the other aims (comprising conservation of nature, water, soil, religious and historic ideals) in a way that would offer economic benefit to the local population and to Nepal (Jefferies 1982). In Australia, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, founded in 1975, was classified into five zones to facilitate separate areas for tourism use and environmental protection (Kelleher and Kenchington 1982). In East Africa efforts were also being made to balance conservation and development. While tourism development was promoted, deliberation was being given to the protection of coastal and marine regions visited by tourists to guarantee that crucial ecological processes were left undisturbed (Kundaeli 1983).

Since the 1970s, sociologists have shown greater interest in the environment than was apparent in the past. By the mid-1970s, all three of the nationwide sociological groups in the United States (American Sociological

Association, Rural Sociological Association, Society for the Study of Social Problems) established divisions concerning environmental sociology (Dunlap and Catton 1979). Special releases on environmental subjects appeared in various sociological journals, for example, *Sociological Inquiry* (1983), *Journal of Social Issues* (1992), *Qualitative Sociology* (1993), *Social Problems* (1993), *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* (1994). The *Annual Review of Sociology* has twice (1979 and 1987) included articles on the sociology of risk. In addition, in 1993, Shirley Laska's presidential lecture to the Southern Sociological Society was called, 'Environmental Sociology and the State of the Discipline' (Laska 1993).

In Europe, encouraged by the appearance of the 'Greens' as a political strength, a great deal of the early sociological work on environmental issues were concerned with environmentalism and the environmental movement (Dunlap and Catton 1992/3: 273). One omission was the Netherlands where groups of activity in environmental sociology developed early on around queries regarding agriculture and risk assessment. In Britain, past inquisitiveness in the sociology of the environment has been clearly theoretical, considering the correlation between society and nature counter to classical sociological viewpoints on social class and industrialism. More recently, empirical sociological research on environmental issues has begun to increase in the United Kingdom, partly due to the motivation supplied by

the Global Environmental Change program set up by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), which has supported seminars, study groups and conventions (Hannigan 1995).

Awareness also began to develop globally. In 1992, the Environment and Society group within the International Sociological Association combined with a second Social Ecology group to create Research Committee 24 Environment and Society, with a collective membership of over two hundred affiliates, many of whom are environmental sociologists. At the 1994 World Congress of Sociology in Bielefeld, Germany, seventeen sessions were programmed including an aggregate of one hundred and fourteen essays on topics reporting on the environment and society. Whereas at the 1993 Centennial Congress of the International Institute of Sociology in Paris, there were a number of seminars on the topic of 'Environmental Risks and Disasters'. Some progress has been made in an effort to calculate this significant substantiation of sociologically based environmental activity (Hannigan 1995).

In the 1970s, Catton and Dunlap started a campaign to convince sociologists of their New Ecological Paradigm (NEP) that was supposed to traverse the well-known divides in sociological theory. This new theory was an academic parallel of green thinking overall, supporting an ideal that was

less 'anthropocentric' (human oriented) and more 'ecocentric' (humans are only one of the many species inhabiting earth). Buttel (1987) portrays their endeavour as encouraging a series of 'lofty intentions' where environmental sociologists 'sought nothing less than the re-orientation of sociology toward a more holistic perspective that would conceptualise social processes within the context of the biosphere' (1987: 466). Catton and Dunlap currently concede that they were unsuccessful in this effort but maintain they never completely expected to accomplish this type of disciplinary change (1992/3: 272). However, while Buttel negatively alludes to environmental sociology as having become just 'another sociological specialisation', Catton and Dulap imply that the revival of curiosity in environmental issues in the 1970s to the present day, particularly those which are worldwide in importance, has inspired new awareness in environmental sociology in the United States as well as globally (Hannigan 1995).

For now, it probably makes sense to adopt Elizabeth Shove's (1994) idea that sociologists can make a constructive contribution to the environmental question by both incorporating and engaging with it. Incorporating implies that parts of environmental research can enhance mainstream sociological theory even if they do not at present have the ability to change the entire discipline. Engaging acknowledges that there is much to achieve in using the sociological imagination to the extra-disciplinary

research of current environmental concerns, for example, through Marxist paradigms or via the sociology of science and epistemology (Hannigan 1995).

Meanwhile, the tourism-environment discussion was being expanded to incorporate the socio-cultural aspects that had been the centre of separate research in the 1970s. A social theory foundation for tourism was advocated by Travis (1982) and a community-based environmental approach was advocated by Murphy (1983). They claimed that tourism is principally resource based and, by disregarding social (as well as ecological) consequences, the industry was in jeopardy of destabilising itself. Murphy (1983) suggested that both the industry and society would benefit from the development of a reciprocally symbiotic affiliation (Dowling 1992).

The tourism-environment relationship received more widespread recognition by the mid 1980s. The significance of the environment to any feature of expansion had been emphasised by the World Conservation Strategy and strong collaboration between tourism and the environment had been encouraged (UNEP/WTO 1983) and instigated (Mlinaric 1985). Additionally, environmental impacts attributed to tourism had been illustrated (OECD 1980; Mathieson and Wall 1982; Pearce 1985), and the need for social and cultural factors to be integrated in planning phases had been advanced (Travis 1982; Murphy 1985, 1988).

Collaboration between conservation and tourism was promoted at a European Heritage Landscapes Conference held in 1985 by Adrian Phillips, the Director of the Countryside Commission of the United Kingdom. He underlined that the interconnectedness between tourism and conservation indicated the need for future co-operation and suggested that there are three reasons why conservation should obtain the support of tourism. These are that tourism supplies conservation with an economic validation, it is a means of fostering encouragement for conservation, and it can bring resources to conservation (Phillips 1985).

A special edition of the *International Journal of Environmental Studies* (1985) pondered the association of tourism and the environment as advancing, with 'Budowski's ideal [being] much more a reality now than it was in 1976' (Romeril 1985: 217). The idea that tourism can be a key means for landscape conservation was also endorsed (Lusigi 1981; Murphy 1986a; Leslie 1986). At the same time the amalgamation of the relationship was also being put forward as an advantage to both trade (Murphy 1986) and regional growth (Pearce 1985). Other features of the relationship were also being analysed, especially the biological impacts of the environment and tourists on one another (Edington and Edington 1986) as well as the environmental carrying capability of tourism (Dowling 1992).

Late in 1986 these ideal theories of the tourism-environment relationship came under wider academic scrutiny. The principle of the tourism-environment relationship was being moderated by the realism that the fundamental conflicts were universal. This divergence of viewpoint was clearly evidenced by the title of a Canadian conference, held in early 1986, called: 'Tourism and Environment: Conflict or Harmony? One paper delivered at the conference was entitled: 'The expanding importance from a global perspective of the tourism interface with wildlife and natural environments'. Conversely, other papers were entitled: 'Tourism and the environment: A natural partnership' (Mackie 1986), and 'The ... tourists are ruining the parks' (Landals 1986).

By the middle of the 1980s the tourism-environment relationship had adopted the terminology that encouraged the three conditions of co-existence, conflict and symbiosis. The 1990s heralded the fifth stage of the relationship between tourism and the environment. During this time it was argued that all three relationships (conflict, co-existence and symbiosis) exist in unison depending on locality and concern (Hall 1991). However, although the relationship in symbiosis has been sought after as the 'ideal', in effect the relationship has been mainly one of conflict (Smith and Jenner 1989). Consequently a new direction for the relationship was advocated, where

both tourism and the environment were regarded as forming a cohesive entirety (Dowling 1990). This is the condition of incorporation where the potential of co-existence, conflict and symbiosis are established and environmentally suitable tourism prospects are developed. Such actions and progress are cultivated if they are environmentally friendly, reduce adverse impacts and increase benefits. This is the heart of sustainable development that was promoted in a key worldwide declaration by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED 1987). Entitled 'Our Common Future' and commonly referred to as 'The Bruntland Report', it scrutinised the world's significant environmental and developmental problems and decided that only through the sustainable use of environmental resources would continuing economic progression be achieved (Bruntland 1987). Hence the term 'sustainable development' was created and the idea began to mould the nature of the impending tourism-environment relationship (Dowling 1992).

This same method was suggested in a special edition of the *Annals of Tourism Research* (1987) that concentrated on tourism and the physical environment. It proposed that tourism and the environment must be incorporated to facilitate environmental integrity and thriving tourism development (Farrell and McLellan 1987). This is symptomatic of changes taking place on an intellectual level as well as at a descriptive level. Farrell

and McLellan (1987) suggested that 'a symbiosis between tourism and the physical environment is the second strand of a dual brand of concern, the first being the contextual integration of both physical and social systems' (Farrell and McLellan 1987: 13). Their argument is that

The true physical environment is not the ecosystem, the central core of ecology. This is an environment (better still an analogue model) perceived by those occupying a subset of the scientific paradigm, and their viewpoint is not exactly the same as the abiotic vision of landscape perceived by the earth scientist or the more balanced landscape or region, the core of the geographer's study (Farrell and McLellan 1987: 12).

Farrell and McLellan's reasoned approach for a more holistic view developed with the need for incorporation of community concern and participation in tourism development as maintained by Travis (1982) and Murphy (1983, 1985). This integrative method is one where the 'resource assets are so intimately intertwined with tourism that anything erosive to them is detrimental to tourism. Conversely, support of environmental causes, by and large, is support of tourism' (Gunn 1987: 245).

Related concerns were also articulated by Romeril (1989a, 1989b). While only four years previously Romeril had championed Budowski's tourism-environment symbiotic relationship (Romeril 1985), he now reasoned that the aim was to sustain a profitable and viable tourism industry without damage to the environment, an intention that became the rule in the 1990s (Romeril 1989a: 208). Additionally, Romeril asserted that 'the

symbiotic ideal of Budowski and Romeril will remain a distant goal while such detrimental change is still seen' (Romeril 1989b: 111). Romeril proposed the increase of alternative or green tourism as a future means of implementing tourism-environment incorporation. This was also suggested by the Centre for Advancement of Responsive Travel (CART) (Millman 1989). Nevertheless, alternative tourism is frequently used as a synonym for appropriate tourism, although in the late 1980s and early 1990s this was beginning to be questioned (Butler 1990; Cohen 1989; Farrell and Runyan 1991).

Research into many different aspects of tourism and the environment were being undertaken in numerous ways during the 1990s. This integration ranged in size from small-scale developments, such as Yankari Game Reserve, Nigeria (Olokesusi 1990) to large-scale developments such as Lake Baringo, Kenya (Burnett and Rowntree 1990). Particular areas studied comprised conservation (Brake 1988) and cultural (Gale and Jacobs 1987), heritage (Millar 1989), social (Brockelman and Dearden 1989) and spatial benefits (Jansen-Verbeke and Ashworth 1990). On a worldwide scale this integrative approach was being fostered by principles of both conservation (McNeely and Thorsell 1989; McNeely 1990) and development (GLOBE '90 1990).

In the 1990s, the nature of the ideal tourism-environment relationship was summarised as a balanced association. The perception that tourism and the environment are a symbiotic or synergistic universal remedy was tempered with the fact that the relationship was still in conflict worldwide. So, it is through the integration of tourism and the environment that conflicts were reduced and symbiotic potential developed. This position was advocated by IUOTO in the 1960s, Haulot and Krippendorf in the 1970s, Romeril in the 1980s and was the basis of the thrust for sustainable development in the 1990s. While earlier development of tourism to increase economic growth was seen as being in a relationship of co-existence, conflict or symbiosis, the analysis during the 1990s was that continuing tourism development will only be maintained by the acknowledgment of the interdependencies that are present between environmental and economic issues and policies. This concept of sustainable development is accepted by those who explain the conflicts (Smith and Jenner 1989) as well as those by those who support a symbiotic approach (Romeril 1989a, 1989b). It has been argued that

An aware and completely changed industry can sustain tourism. In terms of modern thinking and ecodevelopment, if tourism is sustained significant steps have then been taken toward maintaining environmental integrity. A healthy environmental integrity means the possibility of successful tourism, which, when managed properly, becomes a resource in its own right (Farrell and McLellan 1987: 13).

It is apparent from the preceding argument that numerous philosophical views have moulded the means by which researchers and planners consider the tourism-environment relationship. Notwithstanding this mounting interest, Butler (2000: 338) claims that 'the relationship between tourism and the environment is often taken for granted and rarely researched to any depth', and maintains the generally held assertion that 'one among the many myths is that tourism is dependent upon a healthy or pristine environment' (Butler 2000: 338). Nevertheless, as Hall and Page (1999) contend

the environment is the foundation of the tourist industry. The relationship between tourism and the environment is site and culture dependent and will likely change through time and in relation to broader economic, environmental and social concerns (Hall and Page 1999: 131- 132).

With regard to environmentally friendly tourism and particular types of ecotourism, Butler (2000) correctly identified the necessity to recognise that 'certain forms of tourism are very much, or almost entirely dependent upon an apparently pristine environment, and intensive research is needed to identify critical elements of the relationship such as limits, carrying capacity, impacts, aspects of environmental change' (2000: 339).

One unequivocal consequence of outlining the advancement of environmental thought relative to tourism is that the environment is seen as a vibrant and constantly changing backdrop to people, tourists and guides' imaginings. As such a constantly changing entity, the environment is

difficult to measure. Research methodologies to calculate tourism impacts in natural environments have changed to incorporate shifting philosophical attitudes. Miller (1994) acknowledges a genuine developing awareness of tourism's influence on the environment, which resulted in industry's greening incentives (e.g. Diamantis 1999) and also a more widespread public and industry concern about sustainability (see Hall and Lew 1998). Environmental investigation has been concerned with this new area of interest without advancement in attitudes to calculate, observe and consider the explicit and implicit impact of tourism activities on the natural environment (Page and Dowling 2002). As Page, Forer and Lawton (1999) argue

Research is at a relatively early stage of development and there is still much work to be undertaken to establish clear knowledge of cause, effect, systems and interactions. Wider uptake of auditing procedures and improvements in corporate environmental management through legislation and consumer demand will invoke a higher degree of environmental consciousness in tourism based enterprises (Page, Forer and Lawton 1999: 307).

However these procedures and legislation are unlikely to improve the immediate effects of tourism on the environment. A philosophical modification is required by both the tourist and the tourism industry as the mediators of tourist impacts, to appreciate that an envirocentric attitude to both the environment and the way the environment is appreciated as essential. This change of attitude on both sides is fundamental if the

objective of tourism-environment amalgamation is to be accomplished in a framework where impacts are curtailed and indisputable values of sustainability can be cultivated through progress that involves ecotourism (Page and Dowling 2002).

Guiding the Tourists

The occupation of guiding and interpretation can be dated from approximately 460BC, when a description of guides practising their occupation at the pyramids of Egypt is described in the annals of Herodotus and Halicarnassus. These guides frequented the pyramids, and holy men who guided tourists at other religious sites were also referred to as guides. The holy man/interpreter is a repeated figure in travel literature throughout history. The pyramids were not the only antiquated localities where guides were to be found. In the second century AD, the Romans were visiting the lands of Homer and every location had its flock of interpreters (Dewar 2000: 175).

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, young males of noble families went 'on tour' to extend their education. The Grand Tour was the final touch on the scholastic credentials of many young males and, towards the end of the era, young females too (Dewar 2000: 176). Since nearly all of

the pupils were only fifteen to sixteen years old, it was fundamental that they be chaperoned by an instructor/interpreter. Many famous men like Joseph Addison, Thomas Hobbes, Ben Johnson and Adam Smith started their professional careers as tutors. In many locations, the tutors regularly left their wards to parochial 'step-on' guides. The step-on guides had knowledge of the immediate region and environs, unlike the tutors who had a wide-ranging, general knowledge. These step-on guides were compatible experts to the tutors. The best of these were sought after and well compensated. During the three centuries of the Grand Tour, from the sixteenth through the eighteenth century, thousands of guides found work 'educating' the tourists (Dewar 2000: 176).

The character of the contemporary tour guide has its historic beginnings in the Grand Tour of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Dewar 2000; Urry 1990), and in the advent of modern tourism, which inevitably replaced the Grand Tour in the nineteenth century (Cohen 1985: 6).

Guiding, as an occupation in some countries, is managed, controlled and under scrutiny by the tourists engaged in the journey. Nevertheless, the position of the tour guide is made up of many sub-roles (Holloway 1981: 385, 398), which can be explained by the comparison of the various sub-roles

(Cohen 1985). Those differences are often used to categorise and make sense of the various sub-categories (Holloway 1981: 381).

The guiding role is comprised of a number of sub roles, some of which may give rise to intra-role conflict. Typical sub roles will include types such as 'information giver and 'fount of knowledge', 'teacher or instructor', 'motivator and initiator into the rites of touristic experience', 'missionary or ambassador for one's country', 'entertainer or catalyst for the group', 'confidant, shepherd and ministering angel', and 'group leader and disciplinarian'. These roles may be in conflict, as for example where the need to discipline members of the group may conflict with the role of confidant, or where the desire to impart information may be frustrated by the need to entertain a group of revelry makers unwilling to be informed (Holloway 1981: 385-386).

By the late 1800s, guiding and interpretation were acquiring a more modern appearance. Mark Twain's (Samuel Clemens AD 1835-1910) journeys in Europe vividly described the persona and character of the tour guide. Twain's popularity and large book sales encouraged the supply of groups of interpreters and guides who were widely accepted and acclaimed in Europe and the United States (Dewar 2000: 176).

At the same time, in New Zealand, another set of guides was becoming influential. The Maori guides of Rotorua were to become famous from the 1900s. With one exception, all were women. Maori custom gives the women of the community the superior role in making the visitor feel honoured. This custom determined the gender of the guides. The title 'guide' is still accepted with pride by many of the women in the region. The

guides are often awarded regal tributes and hold a position of respect in their communities. These female guides have always been considered 'different' from others in their society (Dewar 2000: 176).

The objectives and purpose of these various interpreters have the legacy of *Interpreting Our Heritage* by Freeman Tilden (1957). Tilden's fundamental principles stay almost unchallenged and his monograph is certainly the most cited handbook in the occupation. His six principles still make up the foundation of much of the interpretive labour performed globally (Dewar 2000: 179-180; Weiler and Ham 2001: 549). The six principles are as follows: First, the narration of the facts about an object or site should relate to the particular entity being interpreted, or the interpretation itself will be ineffective. Second, information giving and interpretation are two separate things. Interpretation includes information, but interpretation is enlightenment based upon information. Third, interpretation is an art form whereby myth, history, geology and factually based data can be presented to interested parties; in this case, the tourists. Fourth, interpretation is not about the instruction of the tourists, but concerns the stimulation of the tour participants' interest. Fifth, interpretation involves the provision of a complete and well-rounded representation of the site or object under scrutiny. Last, age and disposition of the tour participants must be considered. Tilden believes that if guides and

interpreters use his principles of interpretation then they will be undertaking their work in a correct manner (Tilden 1957: 9).

The occupation of tour guide has changed in status throughout the centuries. In the past, guides frequently performed the work of a servant; for example, the porters and bearers of African safari renown. 'Ecotour guiding' is a modern expression, which has evolved with the rise of ecotourism. Some guides are known variously as adventure, nature-based, safari and trekking guides and can all be perceived as ecotour guides (Black, Ham and Weiler 2001: 149).

Nowadays, the guides can seek advice on matters of interpretation and education from recognised bodies such as the Ecotourism Association of Australia (EAA). Ecotourism, for instance, places greater emphasis on this because most guides today are tertiary educated. The higher education levels are needed because of the complexity of the environment, the background of ecotourists, and the complexity of interpretation, for example, interactions of nature with environment and environmental destruction.

The principal obligation of the tourist guide is to produce a social atmosphere and environmental awareness that benefits both the tourist and the guide. Gurung, Simmons and Devlin (1996) suggest that the tour guide

characterises a meaningful function in tourism by improving the calibre of experience for tourists and by lessening unacceptable effects of tourism for the host locations (Gurung, Simmons and Devlin 1996: 113-114).

In my examination of the tour guide literature, I have identified a number of competitive definitions of the tour guide. Many definitions are currently out of date, but over time there has been a progression to a definition of the occupation that is acceptable to current ecotour guiding practices. Schmidt (1979) emphasises the guide as medicine man or shaman:

Theoretically the role of the tour guide between the group and the environment is similar to that of a shaman. Not only must the guide tell stories, myths and local legends and translate the unfamiliar, but he [sic] must also act as a danger minimising mediator between tourists and the environment (Schmidt 1979: 458).

However Pearce (1982), thinks of the guide primarily as nurturer and comforter:

A good guide, working in the correct context, provides a relatively safe and secure context for the tourist to collect those authentic experiences which fulfill the individual's motivation for travelling (Pearce 1982: 75).

Gurung, Simmons and Devlin (1996) have a more fluid definition of guides and acknowledge that the occupation adapts to new challenges. However, they note a change from guides as scouts to their present work of cultural and educative teachers.

The role of the tour guide is evolving, both as tourists demand more qualitative and educational elements in their experience and as residents of destination areas seek to minimise negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts and delimit sustainable levels and forms of tourism. Thus the traditional role of guides as pathfinders is being augmented by that of cultural broker (Gurung, Simmons and Devlin 1996: 124-125).

This study confirms that all the above aspects were seen in the Savannah Guide organisation.

There are two parts to the occupation of the ecotour guide which have evolved from the original profession into the work orientation apparent today. The occupation of the contemporary tourist guide integrates and augments components from two guiding backgrounds, that of the pioneer (path finder) and that of the educator (mentor). The two components, however, do not fit together well because there is a lack of accord and disjuncture between these two positions. According to Cohen (1985), this incongruence explains how the tour guide occupation has developed and come to display the differences of the profession, as it exists today (1985: 9).

Other studies, such as Holloway (1981) have shown that tour guiding comprises a collection of sub-tasks within the main occupation. The central element of the occupation is the 'fact presenting' or interpretive performance, which is highlighted by guides themselves as their main trademark and is the basis of their quest for occupational recognition. Guides use their skills

of interpretation and performance to enhance the tourists' search for a memorable sightseeing experience (Holloway 1981: 377).

Tour guides engage in ritual behaviour that has become part of their daily work obligation in dealing with tourists. For example, consistently ritualised greetings and welcoming addresses to tour groups (see Chapter Five). Clearly determined work tasks have become ritualised and provide interaction with the tourists. Where there is more than one facet of professional responsibility towards the tourists, the aptitude of the guide's performance is not as easy to explain. To some extent, the guides are also dependent upon how the customers engaging in the journeys interpret the destinations and attractions for themselves (Holloway 1981: 385).

Tourists feel an experience is worthwhile if it satisfies certain criteria (Botterill and Crompton 1996; Cohen 1979b). Cohen's (1985) four models of the tourist guide set out this formula. By providing structure and supervision (organiser responsibility) and by mediating contact with host societies (group leader), the tour guide fulfills those group and personal emergencies that involve mediation outside the immediate travel group. For instance, in a remote or isolated situation, being able to locate a doctor or hospital for a sick tourist may be a challenge to the tour guide. By leading the group in social communication and fun (entertainer) and

instruction/interpretation (teacher), most eventualities can be catered for from within the group itself. In all four positions, tasks are directed towards the group members, and not towards outsiders (Gurung, Simmons and Devlin 1996: 109-10; Weiler and Davis 1993: 91).

At all times, the guide must appear to be in control of the tour group, even though people may be working individually, or in small groups. The job of the interpreter is to assure, encourage and endorse all responses and questions. They supply guidance for the tour. Careful consideration of individual idiosyncrasies and contrary opinions within the group is also a trait that is required of the tour guide. Guides must recognise feelings and emotions of tourists and interact accordingly.

The responsibility for achieving customer satisfaction is mostly delegated to the tour guide, who, throughout the tour's entire duration, is in a continuous and intense contact with the tour participants (Geva and Goldman 1991: 178).

Much of the literature confirms that the guides must possess knowledge and education. The tour leader is responsible for observing and lessening visitor impact on the environment so as not to exploit natural ecosystems over and above their human carrying capacity. Thus, the tour leader is responsible for the moderation of visitor conduct to guarantee that it is environmentally accountable. Likewise, the tour guide improves guests' knowledge and

comprehension of their environment regarding the preservation of the region (Weiler and Davis 1993: 93).

The duty of the tour guide, especially in unfamiliar and potentially dangerous landscapes, is to make the environment non-menacing for the tourists because the guide behaves as a cushion and intermediary between the travellers and the exotic locations and indigenous inhabitants (Schmidt 1979: 446).

In other words, tour guides minimise danger when it is present and maximise it (or its possibility) when it is lacking. This equilibrium shifting not only makes the tour alternately interesting and relaxing, but serves to integrate the group and establish its dependency on the expertise of the tour guide. Tour guides, like shamans, establish their expertise and authority by telling their clients (much like parents tell their children) that the environment is a complex and potentially dangerous place, but if they follow the norms (the tour guide's advice) they will be able to manoeuvre their way through it (Schmidt 1979: 458).

In some cases, the guide's position is exactly the opposite of what the nature-adoring tourist wants. Tourists who want to experience the natural setting and its inhabitants find nature not a place for recreation or a 'marker' that must be read, but as a 'site' to be experienced themselves. They do not really want the assistance of an interpreter, but may have joined a guided tour in order to reach the location they wish to see (Almagor 1985: 34; MacCannell 1976: 80).

The guides try to establish a positive emotional bond both with the tourists and with the people the tour group visit (Cohen 1982). Guides sometimes must assume national stereotypes to satisfy foreign tourists. For example, in Australia, this sometimes means employing a persona like the Bushtucker Man, the Crocodile Hunter, Crocodile Dundee or the Barefoot Bushman. While not perhaps a characteristic representation of the typical individual from the host country or region the guide may, nevertheless, embody many of the societal characteristics of the host community for tourists, who may have no other interaction with the people of that country or area (Holloway 1981: 388). As interpreters of a specific site, guides sometimes find themselves performing as representatives for their region or country (Holloway 1981: 387). This stereotype provides a comparison with the guides in my study, who often cater for international tourists who fly into a major city, then immediately fly in a small aircraft to the guide's site. In many cases, the guides may be one of the few 'typical' Australians the tourist meets during the tour.

The tour guide has an important function to perform as a 'culture broker'; one who instructs the tourist in the culture of the sites visited. If it is a fact that 'sightseers are motivated by a desire to see life as it is really lived, even get in with the natives' (MacCannell 1976: 94), then the guide's purpose is to supply entry, physically or emotionally, to the site's 'back

regions' (Goffman 1959: 210). The guide can help tourists accomplish this by supplying them with a greater understanding of the attractions they see than could be attained through superficial examination (Holloway 1981: 387).

The Contemporary Tour Guide

The contemporary tour guide is one who is proficient in both knowledge and performance, and offers a similar emotion to what Riesman (1950) labelled 'inside dopesters'. Uninterested, weary and boring guides are obstructions to allowing the tourists to 'get into' the environment. By educating the tourists, guides help blend them into the setting. On a physical level, too, the tour guide can accommodate integration of the tourists into the environment or surroundings (Schmidt 1979: 454).

Ecotour guides can be perceived as part of the process of consumption of tourism and the environment. It is a widely held belief in the tourism industry that 'it is the guide who sells the next tour'. In other words, the guide's presentation and interpretation will provide a positive platform for the tour company to trade on. A tour's success leads to further and recurring tour product purchases by the tourists from the guide's employing tour company and operation, unless they are from overseas and do not return to Australia (Geva and Goldman 1991: 178). Geva and Goldman (1991) believe that the connection that develops between the guide and the tourists is more

powerful than the attachment between the tourists and the tour company (1991: 179).

Ecotourism needs to protect the environment so, too, do tour guides. Clearly then, tourism needs guides to protect the places visited, but their training, interpretation and supervision must be thoughtfully co-ordinated with the destination location in mind. As ecotourism localities grow and diminish, ecotourism managers find it necessary to constantly re-examine the character and accountability of guides (Shephard and Royston-Airey 2000: 331).

Holloway (1981) indicates that the guide's advocacy role in directing the group and interpreting the attractions lessens the chance for contact with locals because the guide acts as a buffer between the group and outside influences and experiences. The guide directs the tourists where to look, what to look at and, importantly, how to interpret what they see. The group's concentration then becomes inwardly directed towards the guide rather than outwardly directed to the location (1981: 382). The guide not only safeguards the tourists and protects them, the guide is a controlling force in the touring party. The guide also performs an important task in advancing group connection and unity, supplying protection and defence to the challenge of the pitfalls experienced in the tourist location, and

negotiating tourist-host contact (Cohen 1985; Geva and Goldman 1991; Holloway 1981; Pearce 1982). However, people living in the area become part of the attraction and are on display. It is the guide's dramaturgical skills (Goffman 1959) and personal perspective of the destinations that become the focal point of the touristic experience (Holloway 1981: 382).

Indigenous tour guides also provide an important physical buffer between the tourists and the host environment (Pearce 1982). Indigenous guides are very useful in facilitating host-guest interactions (Geva and Goldman 1991: 178). For example, misconceptions about differences in culture are likely to be resolved by guides who have cross-cultural comprehension and training, and who are able to interact competently between diverse societies and bring an 'authentic' version of interpretation to the tourists.

Guides' cultural and educative communication skills are part of their occupation. Weiler and Ham (2001) suggest that the manner in which guides overcome cultural and communication problems and manage tense situations is connected to their own understanding of their position as workers and as tour guides. The guides' cultural and educative skills are, in turn, based upon their background and levels of skill and competence. Many guides consider their primary working task to be that of information

presenter. The importance of the dissemination of knowledge can be attributed to the significance put on the appropriation of information during their indoctrination (2001: 552). For instance, in my research, the process for peer group assessment of an individual guide's interpretation techniques at a given location, produce a profound affect in the guide regarding the verbal assessments by their guide peer cohort (see Chapter Five).

Holloway (1981) states that guides themselves appreciate the accumulation of a comprehensive collection of information as a requirement of the proof of excellence in their work. The precision of the facts they relate is also, in their judgment, an attribute of the specialist worker. Ecotour guides are expected to exhibit an extensive array of knowledge not only of tourist locations and destinations, but of the entire sphere of the touristic and ecological debate. Their information capacity is a mechanism by which the guides can illustrate their aptitude to the tourists. Limited knowledge can sometimes lead to an apprehension of being 'up staged' by an especially erudite tourist, which many guides believe can weaken their command over the tour group (Holloway 1981: 386).

The importance of guides' knowledge is evident in Gurung, Simmons and Devlin (1996). They undertook a study of tour guides in Nepal and found that most of the guides had little interest in learning factual

information and knowledge of the area to tell to the tourists. Consequently, the guides were inclined to give the tourists minimal attention and information (1996: 121). Gurung, Simmons and Devlin also implied that training of guides was insufficient and ineffective due to a scarcity of useful and theoretical information when preparing instruction schedules (Gurung, Simmons and Devlin 1996: 121). Grinder and McCoy (1985) agreed with this position and state that 'visitors often become uneasy when they sense that guides are uncertain about information' (1985: 5). The dissatisfaction tourists experience following an inadequately escorted tour is inclined to prevail for a lengthy period (Grinder and McCoy 1985: 51) and to affect the tourists' choice of subsequent tours and tour guides.

The guide is a mediator between the tourists and the tour company. According to Geva and Goldman (1991) guides mediate in three ways: first, by safeguarding the tourists, second, by maintaining control of the tour group and third, where possible and permissible, customising the tour to each tourist's needs (1991: 179). The guide is in an advantageous position to customise the tour commodity to the tourists' particular requirements and preferences. The tourists frequently see the guide as the one who, by merit of the guide's own aptitude and capability, is likely to supply resolutions for uncertainties brought about by the tour company, and as the individual correcting the company's oversights (Geva and Goldman 1991: 178). 'Most

importantly, the tour leader represents not only the tour group, but the entire organisation' (Tonge and Coulter 1986: 2). On the other hand, Gurung, Simmons and Devlin (1996) observe that an apathetic tourist guide can damage the travel experience by irritability, lack of communication, lack of awareness about cross cultural issues, or the display of an authoritarian manner (Gurung, Simmons and Devlin 1996: 112; Pearce 1982: 74). But customer's satisfaction with the guide's presentation and interpretation, and from the trip, does not inevitably lead to positive reinforcement of the tour company (Geva and Goldman 1991: 178).

The Importance of Emotional Labour for Tour Guides

This thesis fills an important gap in the literature about tour guides and emotional labour. No previous literature has been presented with a juxtaposition of these two areas of investigation in mind. In present times, the sociology of emotional labour has informed the reactions and interactions between service providers and service receivers; for instance, in this study the interactions between the guides and the tourists. My analysis of the occupation of the tour guide would be incomplete without a discussion of how they are employed as workers in the service economy. In presenting this position, it is important that the guides' use of emotional labour and performance should be examined. Performance also forms part of the concept of emotional labour.

Emotional labour, once prevalent in low-status employment, is becoming more important across all job levels in the emerging service economy. What makes emotional labour different from other forms of labour is that it is used up in the delivery of the service to the customer. For example, when the guides are on tour they use the 'emotional labour' mechanism to bond with the tourists and to create a relaxed atmosphere so that the tourists enjoy the tour. Emotional labour is defined by Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) as

the display of expected emotions by service agents during service encounters. It is performed through surface acting, deep acting or the expression of genuine emotion. Emotional labour may facilitate task effectiveness and self-expression, but it also may prime customer expectations that cannot be met and trigger emotive dissonance and self-alienation (Ashforth and Humphrey 1993: 88).

The term 'emotional labour' is used in this thesis to describe a form of labour used by the ecotour guides in this study to interact with the tourists. They are able to incorporate the emotional side of their interpretive work into their tourist products and tours, by the ways they impart both education and knowledge to the tourists. Their efforts at cultural brokerage are also informed by usage of emotional labour.

Erving Goffman (1959) was the first to theorise about performance and interaction between individuals using his concepts of 'frontstage-

backstage'. Goffman's theory is the predecessor to Hochschild's (1983) theory of emotional labour. The work of Erving Goffman includes two valuable ideas: that of the emotional deviant, the person with the incorrect feeling for the circumstances and for whom the correct feeling would be a mindful problem; and that of the observer, for whom each moment of human accomplishment is an extensive story (Hochschild 1979, 1983).

Goffman's 'emotional deviant' manifests a stress on groups which is similar to what would now be considered stress from anti-social behaviour. The view of the emotional deviant lets Goffman show how the social unity we assume must be repeatedly recreated in everyday life. He appears to be relating, in representation after representation, that it takes a certain amount of toil for a group to be spontaneous at the same time, and a different amount of effort to attain total engrossment in a contest. The nature of the effort differs, but the fact is that it remains constant. Under this constant is an implied contrast with what it might be like for the performer to convey what they feel in spite of social restraint or what it might be like if compliance came spontaneously. Unlike Erich Fromm (1942), Goffman does not take for granted that the individual is naturally, compliantly social. Conversely, the individual's social beliefs are not subdued and made insensible, as they are for Freud, but consciously concealed or guarded. The

social uses of emotion are plainly asserted, but it is not clear how the individual, distant from the group, can make use of them (Hochschild 1983).

As an observer, Goffman concentrates on the scene, or the circumstances. Each circumstance, in Goffman's observation, has a social reason of its own that people mechanically maintain. Each circumstance strains the individual, who in response receives security from changeability and membership in an entity bigger than themselves. The emotional deviant is one who makes an effort to evade paying these social duties. Taxes, in succession, come in emotional tender. For instance, awkwardness is an individual's part in the group in the particular sense that awkwardness points out that the individual minds how they appear in a group. Not to feel self-conscious in specific circumstances is to breach the underlying regulation that one should care about how the group manages or mismanages one's character (Hochschild 1983).

The problem with this version of reality is that there is no organised link between all the circumstances. There are duties here and duties there but no idea of an all-encompassing model that would unite the group. Social organisation, according to Goffman, is only our impression of what many circumstances of a certain kind amount to (Hochschild 1983). In the group situation of the tour guide leading the tour group, the guide has exclusive organisation of the group. This leads to group dynamics, where the guide

initially lays down the 'ground rules' for the tour and explains the intricacies of the tour and itinerary to the tourists. Thus, an emotional bond between the group and the individuals within that group occurs.

In considering regulations, actions and performers, Goffman employs the all-encompassing image of acting. His regulations are in general rules that operate when we are 'on stage'. We perform as characters and interrelate with other performed characters. However for Goffman, acting is surface performing. The actor's psychological focus is on the angle of a shoulder, the cast of a glance, or the tautness of a smile, not on any internal emotion to which such motions might be compatible. 'Deep acting' is not as observed in Goffman's work, and the hypothetical assertion about it is respectively unconvincing (Hochschild 1983).

Goffman's theory of regulations and his theory of self are not consistent. He conceives a comparison between regulation and emotion. But the actor he suggests has insufficient inner speech, no enthusiastic aptitude for feeling management that might enable them to react to such regulations. While such regulations and actions thrive in Goffman's work, the self that might carry out such acts, the self that might accept, conform, or contest such regulations, is respectively artificial. Goffman argues as if his actors can generate, or inhibit, or repress feeling – as if they had an ability to mould

feeling. Whatever other dilemmas they put forward, William James and Sigmund Freud anticipated a self that could sense and deal with emotion, Goffman does not do this (Hochschild 1983).

For Hochschild (1979) emotions are subject to 'social rules', and are not controllable entities. These 'conventions of feeling' only become obvious when complicated, recognisable and controlled social regulations of emotion are contravened (1979: 138). Individuals do not acknowledge that they or others are following the social regulations of emotion. However, when an individual is not miserable at a burial or cheerful at a marriage, to use Hochschild's examples, then the social customs become apparent (Hochschild 1979: 138). Hochschild's seminal work *The Managed Heart* (1983), extended her assessment of the connection between social organisation, feeling regulations and emotion control. Through the expansion of the idea of 'emotional labour', Hochschild highlights how managers in the service sector depend on workers to interrelate with customers, to elicit the required emotion. Eliciting the required control of emotion is a central ingredient of the competitive advantage of service-oriented industry, though the exertion that is needed by the personnel is not really recognised and rewarded (Hochschild 1983).

In a well-organised social interaction within the framework of a traditional sales emporium, a sales assistant is accommodating, helpful and enjoys being of service – this is apparent by the expression on the face of the assistant. This represented emotion may not be what the sales assistant really experiences. To lessen the strain between emotion that is experienced and emotion that is accepted, Hochschild (1983) projects two stratagems of feeling management; surface acting and deep acting, the first needing a change in conduct with the expectation of changing inner feelings, and the second involving an emotional change in assessing an interaction. As a result Hochschild is not only concerned with an understanding of social norms and what one is likely to feel, but also how emotion is inhibited or concealed with the purpose of rewarding shared values (Rowan 2003).

Hochschild's effort was a reaction to the growth of the service industry and the increase of what has been expressed above as service encounter-type interactions. While the variety, intensity and degree of contact between the service supplier and the receiver has changed, companies still insist that their employees behave as if they have a bond with the client. For Hochschild the fundamental emotional management display for service givers is to freely exhibit an emotion that they may not automatically covertly feel. Hochschild considers the effects of the condition that a service supplier '... induce or suppress feeling in order to sustain the

outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others' (1983: 7). When the execution of feeling moves from being a closely personal to an unrestricted act performed in accordance with rules, destructive results may ensue, such as absence and alienation from one's sincere feelings (Hochschild 1983: 21).

Although the description of emotional labour first put forward by Hochschild has prevailed, many researchers have improved and developed a variety of features, using the model in diverse situations. Erikson and Wharton (1997) and Leidner (1999) found that Hochschild's simple connection between emotional labour and well-being was not sufficient. Erikson found that the theory was reliant on the level of occupation independence an employee underwent: those with elevated employment independence experienced a smaller amount of harmful effects of emotional labour than did individuals with depleted employment independence (Erikson in Morris and Feldman 1996: 1001). Wharton could not substantiate that employees who carry out emotional labour are more likely to endure emotional fatigue. Moreover, Wharton found that employment fulfilment was certainly connected to emotional labour (1993: 218-220). Other writers, such as Leidner (1999) and Erikson and Wharton (1997), have also highlighted that some employees are thankful for the self-assurance that the practice of emotional labour is able to give them (Rowan 2003).

Countless employees in the tourism industry can be categorised as service workers in the frontline. Their occupations, which entail close client communication, are at the very spirit of numerous tourism endeavours (Wharton 1993). Albrecht and Zemke (1985) concisely express the character of frontline service employment

The service person must deliberately involve his or her feelings in the situation. He or she may not particularly feel like being cordial and becoming a one-minute friend to the next customer who approaches, but that is indeed what frontline work entails (Albrecht and Zemke 1985: 114-115).

Specifically, service employees must handle their own emotions and emotional exhibition to generate a constructive ambience in which a delicate operation happens. While this method of emotion control has become recognised as 'emotional labour', it is still mostly unidentified in everyday work situations (Karabanow 1999). Emotional labour has been described as 'the effort, planning and control needed to express organisationally desired emotion during interpersonal transaction' (Morris and Feldman 1996: 987). This description emphasises the managers' functions in dictating their workers' emotions as well as physical activities (Erickson and Wharton 1997). One way that employers dictate their workers' emotional activities is to supply service manuals for the client service contact. These manuals may vary from straightforward directives to smile and the way in which clients

are to be welcomed and taken leave of, to very precise directions for lengthy and more complicated dealings (Leidner 1999).

Morris and Feldman (1996: 990) refer to Hochschild (1983) to describe emotional labour and contend that it is carried out in one of two ways. Firstly, shallow acting; which includes rousing emotions that are not truly felt. Next, deep acting; which involves efforts to really experience the emotions one is obliged to exhibit (Anderson, Provis and Chappel 2002). The idea of deep acting is also concisely argued by Mann (1997) - 'feelings are actively induced as the actor "psychs" her/himself into the desired persona' (1997: 7).

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) propose that the service employee is perceived 'as an actor performing on stage for an often discriminating audience' (1993: 90). Indeed, Hochschild (1983) considering the recruitment of airline trainees, observed

The trainees, it seemed to me, were also chosen for their ability to take stage directions about how to 'project' an image. They were selected for being able to act well - that is, without showing the effort involved. They had to be able to appear at home on stage (Hochschild 1983: 98).

Larsen and Aske (1992) contend that there is an accord between researchers and 'that the theatre analogy may be used to describe the role-play between

the frontline employee in the hospitality industry and the guest in the role of customer and prospective buyer of services' (Larsen and Aske 1992: 12).

While Hochschild originally focused on the damaging or negative consequences of emotional labour, other authors have indicated that she has overstated the 'human' sacrifice connected with this kind of work (Seymour 2000). For these critics, emotional labour can be either beneficial or harmful for employees depending on how it is carried out (Kruml and Geddes 2000), that is, the degree of agency taken by the worker.

Of equal concern to employers and employees is the one direct harmful effect of the use of emotional labour: exhaustion. Maslach and Jackson (1981) point out that 'burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do "people work" of some kind' (Maslach and Jackson 1981: 99; see also Hochschild 1983). Exhaustion can bring about decline in the worth of service offered and seems to be a source of employment turnover, absence and low self-esteem (Maslach and Jackson 1981). These are familiar conclusions about the high expenditure that companies frequently suffer through absence, employment turnover and mistakes (Ivancevich 1995: 639, 668). This appears not to matter too much to tourism businesses, as burnout and other

related matters seem to ensure a high turnover of staff. In fact, the tourism operators probably welcome it.

Conclusion

The literature on sociology and tourism has provided a base on which to develop a new and more meaningful contemporary understanding of the ecotour guide. Tourism is now almost completely commodified and is one of the major forms of consumption in the west. MacCannell, Urry and Cohen, together with other theorists in the area, have each provided a theoretical stance and background to their understanding of the sociology of tourism. Tourism is also not easily distinguished or separated from leisure, because it is difficult to define the converse or opposite position of work. Tourism is an evolving field of sociological inquiry, where tourists themselves are developing a consciousness of their own, and are not always oblivious to the controls and promises made by astute tourism entrepreneurs. It is obvious that there is no all-embracing theory of tourism, because tourism comprises numerous spheres where many theoretical approaches can be employed (Dann and Cohen 1996).

Further, no specific sociological viewpoint can dominate the field by offering a perception of tourism. Rather, the understanding given by various methods should be considered as a patchwork which, when interconnected,

can provide the foundation for a sociological explanation of touristic authenticity. Indeed, some of the more perceptive work in tourism has been eclectic, connecting aspects of one viewpoint with another, instead of choosing a limited perspective (Dann and Cohen 1996).

The tourism and environment debate has gone through five stages since the 1950s and changed dramatically in the 1960s with the advent of mass tourism and an awareness of the natural environment that sustains tourism. By the late 1980s, the conflict, co-existence, symbiosis debate was foremost on the tourism and environment agenda. Currently, the environment is perceived as a fluid entity, one that is constantly shifting and evolving. These perceptions of tourism and the environment will continue to transform and modify, because both tourism and the environment are not static beings, they develop and progress as society dictates its preferences and desires.

The evolution of tour guides from shaman, to providers of authentic experiences, to interpretive cultural brokers, is a significant central theme in the theory of ecotour guides and ecotourism. Today's ecotour guides provide a far more educative experience, compared to their predecessors, and are more highly educated than previous workers in this evolving industry.

Contemporary ecotour guides use their high levels of education as a marketing tool and promote themselves and their products as educative experiences. Their educational achievements are also a way of distancing themselves from comparison with mass tourism and other less well educated mass tourist guides.

Acting out the task of educator and informer places a large amount of stress or strain on the guides as they lead tour groups. Displays of emotion about the environment and native flora and fauna may be either genuine or staged. Nevertheless, tour guides provide an 'exclusive' service in the experience economy. Their own education and knowledge base are important tools for the generation and sustainability of their employment. Without specialist knowledge and environmental wisdom the ecotour guides in this study would not be in a position to interact emotionally and professionally with their tourist clients.

The next chapter deals with methodological issues that became apparent throughout the collection and analysis of the data and, which form the basis of this research.