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Abstract

Many actors are taking advantage of the flexible barriers to entry of the tourist industry to engage in the production of varied forms of tourism closely related to their lifestyle, professional and communal ambitions. With the increased popularity of forms of tourism bringing the guest close to the host, it becomes relevant to ask questions related to lived experiences and close encounters in tourism scholarship. This is a moral conviction that the plurality of human experiences and critical reflexivity matter in the conception of tourist spaces and their management. In this thesis, I look for new ways to conceptually embed local people in their living spaces by approaching forms of tourism displaying non-economic elements as phenomena that create new and complex relations imbued with various implications. Tourism geography highlights the negotiated and fragmented nature of tourism, and its performative and embodied character. I apply relational geography to apprehend the multiple relations that make up local spaces and identities. With its post-structural character, relational geography uncovers voices once neglected in research, and proposes new ways of being in the world. My two qualitative case studies reflect my interest in exploring the northern European context. Firstly, I investigate craft-artists on Bornholm, Denmark and their relation to the tourist season. I do this through interviews and narrative analysis. My second case study, a focused ethnography at Sólheimar eco-village, Iceland, centres on the management of host and guest interactions. In terms of spatial formation, results show that local actors have the agency to form networks and redefine their identities in the wake of tourism development. They form a hybrid space by fulfilling goals related to their lifestyle, livelihood and professional ambitions simultaneously. Moreover, mundane practices are presented as an integral part of a tourist landscape. In terms of management, results show that the various spatial complexities faced by communities exacerbate host and guest relations. This will require a commitment from local coordinators and managers to promote a reflexive and critical exchange during these close encounters. I ultimately argue for the imagination of tourist spaces as living spaces, where I conceptualize tourism as a mundane, yet complex, material and social experience for those living in tourist spaces. I propose two new discursive anchors that reflect the metaphor of the living space: dwelling in the tourist landscape, and sincere encounters. I contend that researching living spaces finds its moral grounds in its openness to the various ways local people dwell and encounter during tourism, and to the diverse ways researchers make sense of these practices, and of their own.
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1 Introduction

The integration of tourism within living spaces has created new landscapes where local practices and strategies are rearranged to the point where tourism manifests itself in every aspect of contemporary life (Franklin, 2004; Franklin & Crang, 2001; Hall, 2013). The fact remains that tourist spaces are foremost spaces of dwelling where people have to compromise, harness and cope with tourism in the wake of an array of other aspirations related to their position in a complex system that simultaneously enables and limits them (Chaperon & Bramwell, 2013; Milne & Ateljevic, 2001). This is very much the case with forms of tourism, like volunteer tourism, community-based tourism, eco-tourism and rural tourism, which encourage visitors to experience local livelihoods and products by connecting with their hosts through close encounters. As homes, workplaces and other personal and communal spaces increasingly become tourist attractions, additionally attempting to elicit a more sensitive and authentic experience for the tourist, it becomes important to consider the moral dimension of the spatial dynamics of tourism. Tourism scholarship dedicated to the study of these localized forms of tourism remains largely focused on how to integrate the latter within this array of new sites to make the consumption of experiences, lifestyles, cultures and local products a key element of local development (Blackstock, 2005; Mair, 2006), or of personal development for the tourist (Mostafanezhad, 2014). There is little scholarly attention given to such tourist spaces as complex moral realms of performance and negotiation between a host and its guests.

As a social practice, tourism is of course negotiated through a variety of moral issues (Mostafanezhad & Hannam, 2014). Tourists are constantly confronted with ethical dilemmas during their travels. It could be about the decision to fly long-haul in spite of climate change, embark on a volunteer experience to do good, consume local products, or inform oneself about the local culture (Butcher, 2014). As for suppliers, they can find themselves having to make compromises between economic profit and other goals such as environmental sustainability and professional aspirations (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Deville, Wearing & McDonald, 2016; Mostafanezhad, 2016). Macbeth (2015) contends tourism researchers have a long history of adopting a rhetoric of tourism, which places it either as sinner or savior. While tourism has been praised in the work of D’Amore (1988), it has been depicted as a source of cultural and environmental destruction by authors such as Mowforth and Munt (1998). This kind of dichotomous reasoning is far from effective in a world where tourism is constantly growing. Fennell (2006)
argues that those interested in defining the virtues of tourism have been mostly concerned by its impacts. Butcher (2014; 2003) warns that the tensions around ethical norms in tourism often end up revolving around how to turn a holiday into a responsible act of consumption. To Butcher (2014; 2003), this is again a dichotomous view of tourism, which oversees how it is experienced and handled by a variety of different actors.

Hedonism, profit and ethical decisions are intrinsic features of tourism, but they are not always easily reconcilable for neither the host nor the guest. Tourism scholar Kellee Caton (2012, p.1907) concedes that “[…] those of us working in tourism studies operate on loaded moral territory, confronting a phenomenon that at once speaks of light-hearted pleasure and heavy social consequences”. Caton (2012) contends that there is little philosophical questioning in tourism literature over the values and assumptions at the foundation of our visions of what tourism ought to be doing in the world. Nonetheless, with a moral turn taking place in tourism research in light of morality gaining grounds in social sciences since the 1970s, scholars have suggested the application of critical reflexivity and different philosophical traditions to study and promote moral principles in tourism (see Ateljevic, 2009; Feighery, 2011; MacCannell, 2011; Tribe, 2009). The moral turn in social sciences represents a scholarly interest in differences, which geographer David Smith (2000, p.14) defines as: “[…] the fact of diversity, or pluralism, in moral beliefs and practices, as they vary from place to place (and from time to time), as integral features of human cultures and ways of life”. It is not enough to study the world through spatial and quantitative means when we are faced by a host of injustices and inequalities (Smith, 2000). The emergence of new foci of interest such as rural livelihoods, feminist theory and mobility in fields like geography attests to the plurality of human experiences. These themes are ultimately loaded with moral implications. Within tourism scholarship, the interest in a critical and reflexive study of morality has flourished in the last decade. Caton (2014; 2012; 2011) has contributed to the moral turn in tourism by proposing methodologies more sensitive to the subjects’ understanding of the world. The recent book by tourism scholars Mary Mostafanezhad and Kevin Hannam (2014) Moral Encounters is further testament to the significance the moral turn is gaining in tourism research.

The plurality of human experience at the heart of the moral turn in social sciences is a significant feature of tourism development. Tourism is a fragmented industry, made up of diverse actors from both the public and private sector, participating to various degrees in formal and informal economies (Gibson, 2009; Hall, 2013). This is especially the case when tourism
is used for non-economic purposes as diverse as artistic development, cultural exchange and social sustainability by various local actors, and reportedly enjoyed for more than hedonistic reasons by tourists. It must also be considered that the boundaries are increasingly blurred between tourism and other forms of travel (Gibson, 2009). Volunteer tourism and working holidays exemplify the new mobilities tourism researchers have to deal with. These alternative forms of tourism have moral implications as host and guest meet in intimate ways, such as in homes and communal spaces. Mostafanezhad and Hannam (2014), therefore, chose to define morality in tourism in terms of encounters. It is not surprising since encounters would have to be the defining feature of tourism. As Gibson (2012; 2010) explains, we travel in order to live the pleasures of encountering, might it be friends, people, information, places, cultures or particular physical features of the landscape such as the beach. Moralizing on the meaning of tourism would thus compel the tourism researcher to focus on the myriad relational aspects of the experience of hosting tourists, including all the socio-cultural implications and spatial dynamics behind them.

1.1 Aims and Research Questions

An engagement with the moral turn in tourism scholarship opens an avenue for the researcher to question the kind of spaces tourism creates. My primary aim is to imagine new ways for researchers to conceptually embed people closely involved with tourists within their living spaces by approaching tourism as a multifaceted phenomenon that creates new and complex relations imbued with various spatial, but also personal, social, communal and professional implications. I use the word imagine to denote my interest in forming a mental image of something not yet present. More exactly, I seek to contribute to new ways of conceptualizing close encounters and spatial dynamics in tourism.

To achieve this aim, I identify the processes behind the construction of places and identities, which outline the plurality of coping strategies, embodiments and negotiations that make up two particular tourist spaces. More specifically, I do this in the northern European context, where I explore the actions and ambitions of rural stakeholders and of an eco-community. I address my aim through the following research questions:

- In what ways do local people deal with the presence of tourism in their living space in regards to their particular spatial, personal, and professional identities? (RQ1)
How are places formed through the actions and strategies of local groups as their living spaces simultaneously become tourist spaces? (RQ1.1)

Why would these responses legitimize the presence of tourists and tourist infrastructure within a living space? (RQ1.2)

- How are encounters between host and guest experienced by the host as the latter makes sense of particular communal goals and alternative tourism strategies simultaneously? (RQ2)
  - How can encounters be managed in the light of these different ambitions? (RQ2.1)

In a second instance, I explore the moral implications of scientifically researching and practically fostering different types of alternatives in tourism in highly dynamic and performative spaces. It became apparent as my research project unfolded that my role as a reflexive and attentive researcher was closely linked to the achievement of my aim. Contributing new ways of thinking in tourism studies implies working with methodologies that consider local experiences as fundamental to the study and practice of tourism. An emerging aim which I will take up later in this dissertation is to outline methodologies sensitive to the experience of people navigating ambiguous positions in a complex realm.

1.2 Structure of Thesis: Two Cases, Four Articles

The aims of this thesis are reached through the study of two northern European research contexts. Table 1 gives a short summary of the four articles I have produced. I address my research questions as follows:

**Paper I:** Through an engagement with rural geography and rural tourism literature, I identify strategies used by craft-artists in Denmark negotiating multiple goals through rural tourism. The integration of the countryside into global processes impact individual and collective strategies related to lifestyle entrepreneurship, rural identities, the commercialization of rural symbols and products, and local modes of production. I conclude that rural actors consequently create for themselves a hybrid space, strategized and redefined in relation to the complexities of residing in a countryside integrated within a global system.
Paper II: I explore the embodied practices of craft-artists that turn a landscape of everyday life into a tourist landscape. Through the application of non-representational theory, I present the tourist landscape as a realm of dwelling where local materials, techniques and spaces mediate interactions with tourists, but also where encounters mediate local interactions with materials, techniques and spaces. This non-representational analysis of local narratives, collected in the study participants’ realm of involvement, is done to offer a way for researchers to embed local people in their cultural landscape.

Paper III: I investigate host-guest dynamics at Sólheimar eco-village, Iceland, in order to contribute insight to the conceptualization of transformative learning in volunteer tourism. I propose that the experience that binds the host and its guests cannot solely be about learning to do things alternatively and sustainably. It can be sincerity over the difficulty of doing things alternatively and sustainably that characterizes this experience. I argue that transformative learning during the volunteer experience should be conceptualized to include the promotion of sincere encounters, and made to concern both the host and its guests to become a more useful practice in volunteer tourism.

Paper IV: I examine the managerial contradictions and difficulties that arise as alternative tourism is developed in the name of sustainability at Sólheimar eco-village. The coordination of alternative tourism venues requires practical efforts that go beyond notions of keeping operations small, interactive and contextually sensitive. I conceptualize alternative tourism as a forum for discussion between host and guest over the complexities of generating sustainable development. Immersing the researcher in the study context is proposed to bring forward the complex dynamics alternative tourism stakeholders face.

As for the structure of this thesis, I first present my theoretical framework where I delve into tourism geography and relational geography. Following is the chapter on my research design where I describe my research context, methodological approaches and data collection process. A section of the research design chapter is also dedicated to some methodological considerations. All four articles are presented through extended abstracts before I discuss my findings and their main moral, practical, theoretical and methodological implications.
Table 1: Short summary of individual papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question(s)</th>
<th>Paper I</th>
<th>Paper II</th>
<th>Paper III</th>
<th>Paper IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ1.1</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>RQ2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ1.2</td>
<td>RQ1.1</td>
<td>RQ2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical underpinning</th>
<th>Paper I</th>
<th>Paper II</th>
<th>Paper III</th>
<th>Paper IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational space and rural geography</td>
<td>Non-representational theory and the dwelling perspective</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism and transformative learning</td>
<td>Alternative tourism and community sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Paper I</th>
<th>Paper II</th>
<th>Paper III</th>
<th>Paper IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bornholm’s craft-artists</td>
<td>Bornholm’s craft-artists</td>
<td>Sólheimar eco-village</td>
<td>Sólheimar eco-village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of tourism</th>
<th>Paper I</th>
<th>Paper II</th>
<th>Paper III</th>
<th>Paper IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural tourism</td>
<td>(Non-applicable)</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism</td>
<td>Alternative tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Paper I</th>
<th>Paper II</th>
<th>Paper III</th>
<th>Paper IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended interviews</td>
<td>Open-ended interviews</td>
<td>Participant observations</td>
<td>Participant observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Paper I</th>
<th>Paper II</th>
<th>Paper III</th>
<th>Paper IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative analysis</td>
<td>Narrative analysis</td>
<td>Focused ethnography</td>
<td>Focused ethnography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2 Thinking about Tourist Spaces Relationally**

In this section, I will firstly direct my attention to tourism geography. Tourism geography concerns itself with the analysis of tourism as a social phenomenon occurring in time and space (Mitchell & Murphy, 1991). With tourism becoming an object of increasing concern for society, the environment and local livelihoods, new research frontiers have evolved in geography taking the shape of critical thoughts related to themes as diverse as justice, social interactions, uneven power relations, species and cultural preservation and the experience economy, to name a few (Gibson, 2008; Hall, 2005). Tourism geography, with its interest in the socio-cultural formation of tourist space and its ethical dimension, is thus a highly relevant approach to the study of lived experiences and encounters.

In my account of tourism geography, it is the fragmentation and negotiations that make up tourist spaces that interest me on the one hand (Paper I), and the performative and embodied nature of these hybrid social and material spaces on the other (Paper II). These represent the two levels at which tourism can be conceived: the spatial and the interpersonal. Both are important to consider as they complicate in their own way the dynamics of encounters in tourism. Additionally, alternative tourism is a significant concept to address in a discussion on more sensitive ways to do tourism. Its many forms have been criticized by tourism scholars for failing in this mission (Weaver, 2009; 2007; 2006). Looking closely at social performances and spatial negotiations reveals the plurality and complexity of managing and living with alternative tourism (Papers III and IV). In terms of morality, it becomes increasingly relevant to consider the multiple complex local experiences tourism creates in order to reflect upon, and hopefully improve, the meaning of encounters as tourists penetrate more intimately their hosts’ spaces.

The theoretical approach which I use to underpin my contribution to the moral turn in tourism scholarship is relational geography. Relational geography implies the world is formed through the way spaces, objects and people relate to each other (Cresswell, 2013; Murdoch, 2006). With its foundation in post-structuralism, relational geography does not reflect interest in single entities and their essential characteristic, but rather in the processes that bring these entities into being (Cresswell, 2013; Murdoch, 2006). I present relational geography as a means to appreciate the diversity of figures, voices and regimes that make up space as networked, negotiated and
performative. I outline the post-structural character of relational geography to propose new ways of thinking about social and material relations. I ultimately use relational geography to advance an enriched conceptualization of the processes and experiences that make up tourist spaces, and to propose the formation of new language to describe alternatives and morals in tourism to define more adequately how the latter ought to be. I highlight the potential of applying language related to *dwelling* (Paper II) and to *sincerity* (Paper III) to tourism geography.

2.1 Imagining Tourist Spaces: Fragmentation and Negotiation

The tourist experience implies an immersion in unfamiliar territory and varying degree of contact with new people, their culture, customs and language. To understand tourism as a social phenomenon impacting local experiences and spaces around the world, scholars have early on been caught up in dichotomies between the authentic and the modern, and the exotic and the ordinary, which link travel to a search for the pre-modern and extraordinary. Dean MacCannell (1976) articulated this form of reasoning by advancing that tourism was the result of staged-authenticity where cultural groups showcase their cultures in different staged form to satisfy the viewers’ desire for exotic sights. Under this rhetoric, tourism is founded in the search for otherness. The relevance of this type of authenticity has been questioned to suggest a consideration for post-modern hyper realities and new purposes of travel not centered on exotic sights (Stephen, 1990; Urry, 1990; Wang, 1999).

John Urry (1990), who first came up with the concept of the tourist gaze, was inspired by Michel Foucault’s (1973) medical gaze where the way the doctor sees the body through his or her medical approach ultimately defines the way the body will be manipulated, and, as such, formed. As tourists look for sights, experiences and novelties they cannot find at home, their gaze influences the way places around the world are (re)made.

Wang (1999) concedes that the theories of staged-authenticity and the tourist gaze fell short of explaining post-modern sites and social phenomena in tourism such as attraction parks, visiting friends, outdoor activities, beach holidays, ocean cruising, and the pursuit of hobbies such as fishing or shopping while traveling. In this regard, Franklin and Crang (2001) claim that tourism is not solely done for escapism. Furthermore, the growth lately in working holidays, educational tour and volunteerism demonstrates that tourists can become actively involved in their destination (Wearing, 2001).
Such conceptual and theoretical developments challenge notions of tourism as an out of the ordinary experience (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). The rapidity of changes and intermixing that make places multiple, extroverted and integrated in the global system are complicating the differences between what is home and away, host and guest, ordinary and extraordinary, and even place and placelessness (Massey, 2005; 1991). Tourism is not part of a clearly defined bounded system, and rather evolves in relation with multiple local and extra-local phenomena (Britton, 1991; Ioannides & Debbage, 2004; 1998).

The complex features of tourism were made obvious through the work of economic tourism geographers. In the first instance, though tourism has to various degrees homogenized certain places into standardized destinations, it has also fragmented many of them into complex spectrums of consumption and production (Ioannides & Debbage, 2004; 1998; Torres, 2002; Williams, 2004). Even in highly touristic areas, global accommodation and transport chains have paved the way for smaller operators, artisans, street performers, musicians, stallholders, sex workers and drug dealers, to make a livelihood out of encountering tourists (Gibson 2009). The tourism industry is, therefore, difficult to assess as it encompasses various alternative types of regimes of accumulation. Stephen Britton (1991), in his seminal paper on tourism commodification, presents tourism as related to the Fordist regime of mass consumption and production, but other scholars have identified in tourism pre-Fordist regimes of artisanal production typical of small-scale enterprises with new niche markets showing great flexibility (Williams, 2004). For instance, Torres (2002) identifies a blend of regimes of accumulation in Cancun, where the predominant market of mass consumption has evolved to cater to specialized markets of consumers interested in more than a beach holiday. The evolution of various forms of niche tourism attest to the fragmentation of the tourism industry.

Increasingly, traditional production sites are transformed into spaces of touristic experience. The line is often blurred between the workplace and the place for leisure as the consumers end up sharing the same space as the workers (Everett, 2012). For example, Everett (2012) observed that food tourism brought small producers to open up their bakeries, smokehouses and dairies to tourists, confusing the distinction between the workplace as a sanitized space of production, and the tourist space as one of consumption and experience. Furthermore, Ateljevic and Doorne, (2004) speak of tourism businesses as often the result of the consumption of a particular lifestyle by its producer, such as surfing, hiking or diving. In Paper I, I have studied Bornholm’s craft-artists as consumers of a rural lifestyle and producers of a
brand based in professionalism. Here again, consumption and production share the same space in a blurred fashion as niche markets are created. With such fragmented dynamics, tourism is more of a hybrid economic formation intermixing various industries, state regulations, nature and culture, the informal sector, capitalist and non-capitalist economies, and all kinds of technologies, commodities and infrastructures (Darbellay & Stock, 2012; Debbage & Ioannides, 2004; D’Hauteserre, 2006; Gibson, 2009).

Secondly, tourism is difficult to conceive as one realm of mass accumulation as it relies on the consumption of varying experiences (Crang, 2004). Tourism is in large the result of a performance, rather than the acquisition of a series of products created and subsequently consumed (Edensor, 2000; 1998; Franklin & Crang, 2001). As Ateljevic and Doorne (2004) express, places are (re)created according to the behaviors performed around them. This is significant for spatial dynamics as it implies that tourists and tourist entrepreneurs alike will go where their values are, or can be, imprinted (see also Ateljevic & Doorne, 2001). This is why Hultman and Hall (2012) believe that during the development of a destination, a new locality is made to appear. The construction of tourist spaces implies interplay between tourist, intermediaries and local inhabitants and stakeholders as the meaning of what exactly the local attraction will consist of is negotiated (Ateljevic, 2000; Ateljevic & Doorne, 2004; Gordon & Goodall, 2000; Hultman & Hall, 2012). These negotiations will define the legitimate tourist activities performed by the host, guests, and other stakeholders involved, fostering the values, institutions, sanctions, customs and rules that will upkeep the development of a certain form of tourism at a destination (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2003). Irene Ateljevic (2000) calls this phenomenon circuits of tourism, where consumers and producers communicate and negotiate within particular social and institutional contexts the nature of the product at stake, eventually producing and reproducing discourses and practices that uphold this construction.

Tourism has become a ubiquitous feature of modern life. The integration of tourism within local spaces has created new landscapes where local practices and strategies are rearranged to the point where tourism manifests itself in every aspect of contemporary life (Darbellay & Stock, 2012; Franklin, 2004; Franklin & Crang, 2001). As tourism is integrated into new places, it engulfs people into a dynamic system where they continuously have to re-negotiate and re-affirm themselves. The third point of interest for economic tourism geographers is thus related to the interrelated dynamics of dependency and agency at play in tourism development. Milne and Ateljevic (2001) emphasize the need to study the networks that enable local actors to
collaborate to overcome their disadvantages. These networks can come in the form of professional associations that protect the quality of local products, such as arts and crafts as I show in Paper I, in the light of commodification and standardization in tourism development. Many tourism scholars contend that we should not view nations, regions and communities as powerless in the face of tourism, forced to comply with economic and cultural globalization (Amoamo, 2011; Ateljevic & Doorne, 2003; Oakes, 1999; Meethan 2003; 2001). Milne and Ateljevic (2001) believe the overarching challenge is to enable local economies to thrive and unique socio-cultural and environmental resources to survive in a globalized world. Tourism is as a transaction process driven by global priorities where actors such as residents, governments and entrepreneurs interact to face these phenomena (Milne & Ateljevic, 2001).

Researchers have illustrated through case study research the dual forces of agency and dependency faced by actors involved in tourism processes (see Bramwell, 2011; 2003; Bramwell & Meyers, 2007; Meyer, 2013; Pastras & Bramwell, 2013; Torres & Momsen, 2004). For instance, Chaperon and Bramwell (2013) demonstrate that actors on Gozo were able to oppose a national project to construct a golf course by coming together as residents, environmentalists and nature-users to demonstrate their opposition. The protestors’ agency encouraged the formation of a global association to network with extra-local agents, ultimately preserving Gozo according to the locals’ wishes. Su and Teo (2008) describe how residents in Lijiang, China reclaim their local square from the growing numbers of tourists for their own purposes by attaching their daily activities to it. Through performing their own traditional dances on the Square unannounced, the local dancers’ actions become: “[…] part of the vernacular landscape, which is also incorporated into the everyday of tourism in Lijiang” (Su & Teo, 2008, p.164). Local actors are here presented as active agents in the formation of a cultural space.

These two cases show two different kinds of activism emanating from the individual and collective will of actors strategically thinking within a tourism system that engulfs them in the dynamics of globalization. Examples of local negotiations and compromises are also evident in rural spaces where local actors produce and distribute goods and services that reflect values such as their local identity, belonging and autonomy (MacDonald & Jolliffe, 2003; Sims, 2009). Sims (2010) observed that local producers would modify their definition of local foods to surpass practical issues as their relations with other actors in the chain of production evolved. Local suppliers who expanded their businesses to the extent that they could no longer get the ingredients they needed for their shops, cafés or restaurants from local producers would
redefine their status as local suppliers in terms that could accommodate these practical changes. Similarly, I demonstrate in Paper I that reconciling an artistic career, rural lifestyle and livelihood implies redefining what is local and authentic in the creation of crafts, and what success is, in the pursuit of an artistic career. Agency is here seen in the ability of stakeholders to redefine their position and identities within global chains of productions.

2.2 Imagining Tourist Spaces: Encounters and Embodiment

An interest in the way local actors respond to the complex and fragmented nature of tourism development gives insight into the diverse ways of experiencing tourism as a pervasive global phenomenon with significant spatial implications. However, it cannot be disregarded that at the foundation of tourism there are performative encounters and multi-sensorial experiences, which also impact local spaces (Crang, 2004). Since its apparition in tourism discourse, Urry’s (1990) tourist gaze has been criticized for its neglect of experience and consciousness (Larsen & Urry, 2011). Some scholars deplored the lack of consideration for social interaction and other senses, such as touching, feeling, smelling and hearing, while on holiday (Edensor, 2006; Johnston, 2001; Obrador-Pons, 2007; 2003; Perkins & Thorns, 2001). These considerations gave rise to the espousal of the performance turn in tourism scholarship, which ultimately implied a recognition that tourism emerges from corporeal and relational performances, and not merely by its imposition on a scenic backdrop (Baerenholdt, Framke, Larsen & Urry 2004; Edensor, 2006; 2001; 2000; Larsen, 2012; 2010).

Through the performance turn, Edensor (2006; 2001; 2000) presents tourism as materially and symbolically staged through the work of key staff members following scripts and using props to guide the tourists in their performances. Larsen (2012; 2010) also highlights how tourism resembles theatrical performances where workers are cast members wearing costumes and trained to play their act, which often includes smiling and being polite to guests. As I explore in Paper II, the craft-artists of Bornholm are cast as performers during their island’s tourist season as their workshops and boutiques have become part of the tourist landscape. Under such terms, places are made and managed to adhere to the nature of tourist performances, rather than a gaze (Baerenholdt et al., 2004; Edensor, 2006; 2001; 2000; Larsen, 2012; 2010). They become the nexus where hosts, guests, workers, buildings, props and machines are constantly brought together to perform their social
role (Hannam, Sheller & Urry, 2006). These theatrical stages are constantly enacted through the embodiments of diverse individuals and the enrollment of various material elements, transformed each time they are played out by these actors (Baerenholdt et al., 2004; Edensor, 2006; 2001; 2000; Larsen, 2010, 2012). The performance turn is a recognition that tourism is a social performance related to doing, touching and being, which taken together generate tourist spaces (Coleman & Crang, 2002).

The performance turn has enabled tourism researchers to look more closely at the various types of actions occurring during the host and guest encounter. This type of analysis focused on movements has led tourism scholars to call for the de-exoticization of tourism as it exhibits the mundane nature of these performances, often far from the extraordinary (Larsen, 2008; 2005). The tourist never fully escapes familiar and prescribed coded patterns of behavior. Often with the help of tourism workers, tourists carry quotidian habits and responses with them on holiday, which offer reminders of situations of control at home (Baerenholdt et al., 2004; Edensor, 2006; 2001; 2000; Obrador, 2012). For instance, wake-up calls and bathroom breaks are often based on a schedule reminiscent of the one from a busy day at work, bodies are groomed to fulfill the same beauty standards followed at home, and the souvenir shops sell banal objects such as t-shirts, magnets and mugs.

The performance turn recognizes that there is always room to uncover creativity and detours, making tourism performances innovative for all actors involved (Edensor, 2001; 2000; Larsen, 2012; 2005). Human activities are fluid and spontaneous, rather than deterministic, and can lead to various unscripted and unexpected performances (Weaver, 2005). Performances between host and guest are not solely mediated by the socio-cultural expectations of a tourist gaze. As Maoz (2006) demonstrates in her study of Israeli backpackers in India, local Indians project the performances expected of them back at Israeli backpackers in search of spiritual gurus. This shows that power is not the property of any particular actor during the tourist encounter, but rather flows between the host and guest who both gaze at each other, provoking particular performances in return (Maoz, 2006). Moreover, interrelational performances found in being with friends, family members, team members or with other individuals on holidays are sometimes more pleasurable than following scripted gazing (Haldrup & Larsen, 2010; Obrador-Pons, 2007; 2003). Tucker (2007) and Edensor (1998) both observed in different settings young participants on guided tours who ended up paying more attention to each other, and even making fun of their guide’s scripted performance and the iconic scenery, during their group travels. The social
character of tourism attests to the everydayness of its practice as most tourism performances are done to derive pleasure of being with friends and relative, rather than seeing the extraordinary (Haldrup & Larsen, 2010).

With the adoption of performative theoretical approaches in tourism scholarship, an increasing amount of tourism scholars are now more mindful of the multisensory interactions between human, non-human, and materials that take place in fluid and complex ways in tourism (Gibson, 2012; 2010; Grimwood, 2014). Non-humans such as mundane objects, technologies, plants and animals mediate the performances that connect the body to an environment (Crouch, 2000; Michael, 2000). Mundane materials such as gardening soil and walking shoes, as well as cameras, guide books and bungie cords, involve the human subject directly in the world (Bell & Lyall, 2002; Haldrup & Larsen, 2006). Bodies and objects function to give space its practical, symbolic and expressive form (Whatmore, 2002). Tourism scholars have researched the interactivity of social bodies with nature for instance (see Cloke & Perkins, 2005; Waitt & Cook, 2007; Waitt & Lane, 2007). Waitt and Cook (2007), researching the embodied nature of practicing ecotourism, argue that experiencing nature does not truly move participants towards a new perception of their relation to its non-humans. Rather, discourses of environmental ethics prevent the participants to appreciate nature beyond gazing. As for me, I use Paper II to demonstrate that, in the case of Bornholm’s craft-artists, the materials of their crafts have a way to guide their interactions with tourists. The materials that require more showy techniques are more appealing to the tourist audience. Studying encounters thus relates to the way various mundane interactions are mediated through an interplay between the social, bodily, spatial and material in tourist spaces.

2.3 Imagining Alternative Tourism

Imagining how spatial and social dynamics evolve during tourism is important as this industry keeps expanding. Too many people find travelling to be useful to their lives, and too many people depend on it as a source of income in an industry with traditionally low entry costs. This is why Gibson (2012; 2010) upholds that tourism encounters necessitate constant analysis and reflection. Looking closely at both embodied social performances and spatial negotiations in tourism coincides with the moral grounds of plurality and relationality I discussed in the introduction. It becomes relevant to consider the multiple and complex local human experiences tourism creates in order to reflect upon, and hopefully improve, the meaning of encounters as tourists are penetrating more and more their hosts’ spaces.
Local experiences of close encounters with guests display to varying degrees alternative elements to what Obrador, Crang and Travlou (2009) call the *industrialization of leisure*, characterized by the standardized holiday in the highly touristic space. While I use Papers I and II to explore a form of tourism that finds its alternative element in the contact between the consumer and the producer of a place-based hand-made product within a personal local space, there are forms of tourism that foster more direct engagement in living spaces. The emergence of the concept of alternative tourism substantiates the pervasiveness of tourism in modern society. Living spaces are increasingly becoming tourist spaces where an intimate cultural learning experience is offered by the host and expected of the guest (see Deville, Wearing & MacDonald, 2016; Miller & Mair, 2015; 2014; Mostafanezhad, 2016; 2014). Alternative tourism gained increasing popularity in discourses of ethics, responsible tourism, community empowerment and sustainability because of its purported sensitive approach to the needs of host communities (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; 2006; Scheyvens, 2012; 2002a; Singh, 2002). Moreover, alternative forms of tourism are meant to foster close interpersonal exchanges between host and guest, where learning and helping are often key binding factors (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2008; 2006; McIntosh & Zahra, 2007; Zahra & McGehee, 2013). Alternative tourism thus promises a more just and honest form of encounter between host and guest, based in reciprocity, rather than reflecting modern consumer culture (Jafari, 2001).

In Papers III and IV, I take a managerial outlook on close encounters and community sustainability to explore the dilemmas behind a type of tourism, volunteer tourism, commonly associated with the concept of alternative tourism. The conceptualization of a form of tourism supporting non-economic objectives opposite to traditional tourism has its roots in the emergence of notions of making tourism a tool for local development (Weaver, 2006). With the rise of global concerns for sustainable development in the 1980s came concern over the impacts of tourism. There was a notion that tourism should be beneficial for more than economic purposes, and at least be benign to the cultures and environment it touched (Butler, 1999). Alternative tourism was recognized by some academics as the form of adaptability that was needed to procure alternative options to mass tourism (Gonsalves, 1987; Holden, 1984; Dernoi, 1981), the latter often conceived as destructive for local environments and cultures by bringing horde of people to fragile spaces. The commitment to make tourism a more ethical practice is obvious in the theoretical description of alternative tourism. Alternative tourism was defined as a form of tourism related to: “[…] *authentic, cultural*,
historical and natural attractions that are perceived to capture a destination’s unique sense of place and allow for interactions between visitors and local residents” (Weaver, 2006, p.38). Alternative forms of tourism are associated with limited environmental and social impacts and greater participatory opportunities for local businesses as their activities are smaller in scale (Kirsten & Rogerson, 2002; Oriade & Evans, 2011; Weaver, 2006). Different niches of alternative tourism have emerged over time proposing experiences in for instance: eco-tourism, rural tourism, pro-poor tourism, volunteer tourism, community-based tourism, and agro-tourism (Weaver, 2006). Besides entrepreneurs, as explored in Papers III and IV, communities, such as Sólheimar eco-village in Iceland, have opened up to volunteers to help them meet their sustainability goals.

This promise to move towards a more localized, sensitive and interactive form of tourism would arguably set the ground for the imagination of an alternative economy where ethical practices would matter (Gibson-Graham & Cameron, 2007; Wearing, McDonald & Ponting, 2005). However, imagining alternative tourism as a best-practice does not come without its dilemmas. The different forms of alternative tourism have been criticized, fostering skepticism in tourism scholarship as to their ability to promote the sustainable development they promised (Butcher, 2005; 2002). Alternative types of tourism turned out to be only partial solutions as tourist destinations with small carrying-capacities became increasingly flooded with visitors regardless of their targeted size of audience (Butler, 1999). It is now evident that the logic by which there is, on one end of a spectrum, a good form of tourism, such as alternative tourism, and, on the other end, another form of tourism, mass tourism, which is bad, is now discarded as too simplistic and impractical (Weaver, 2013). To Cohen, (1972), Scheyvens (2002b), and Wheeller (1997), numerous forms of tourism, initially meant to be sensitive and small-scale such as eco-tourism and backpacking, have intensified in the past decades becoming increasingly standardized, and not so diversified from the mass tourism they were meant to replace. Alternative tourism has been accused of being a mere marketing scheme to generate higher business profits, rather than being the result of environmentally and socially conscious entrepreneurship (Butler, 1999; Weaver, 2009; 2007). Many volunteer tourism organizations offering volunteer experiences in poverty stricken places are accused by tourism scholars of seeking their own reproduction as capitalist ventures, following the conventional procedure of cultural commodification and uneven power relations, which undermines local developmental goals (Guttentag, 2009; Palacios, 2010; Sin, 2010).
Evidently, bringing the host and guests closer together within the complex tourist system will require better solutions than to content ourselves with offering small-scale alternatives (Clarke, 1997; Weaver, 2013). It cannot be forgotten that the negotiations and performances behind the development of alternative tourism are linked to processes of hybridization taking place around the world at tourist destinations. If the process of negotiation and fragmentation described earlier in this section teaches us something it is that the spatial dynamics of tourism are complex and involve many actors, objects, and places (Britton, 1991; Darbellay & Stock, 2012; Hall, 2013; Ioannides & Debbage, 2004; 1998). What is especially problematic with alternative forms of tourism is that, not only are local actors handling the presence of guests in private and communal spaces such as their homes, natural environments, and workplaces, they are doing this with more than economic goals in mind. The unfortunate reality that economic goals are given priority over other socio-environmental goals in alternative tourism can be linked to the sheer nature of the capitalist system that equates survival with profit (Mostafanezhad, 2016). As Coghlan and Noakes (2012) outline, in this case in terms of charitable organizations, stakeholders must ultimately compromise between making money from selling an experience and following their alternative mission. Mostafanezhad (2016) illustrates this reality nicely with her study of organic farm volunteering holiday, where environmentally conscious hosts were forced to buy in bulk at food chain stores to afford feeding their guests. The food they grew on their farm was too expensive to give away to volunteers, highlighting that their goals of environmentalism could not outweigh their economic survival. Negotiations, reinvention, and compromises intensify as non-economic goals, such as professional artistic development (Paper I) and community sustainability (Papers III and IV), side with economic goals in a global system (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012).

It is all the more apparent in spaces that are meant to foster alternative lifestyles, such as the organic farm or eco-village, that the volunteer’s desire to experience and learn is not always compatible with local practical goals (Deville, et al., 2016; Mostafanezhad, 2016; Yamamoto, & Engelsted, 2014). I highlight in Paper III that this divergence is often identified by tourism researchers, but mostly overlooked as a managerial issue needing reflection. Re-imagining alternative tourism as a moral practice requires meticulously looking at how local actors handle their close encounters with tourists within their own living spaces. As Salazar (2012, p.18) contends, in terms of community-based tourism: “Local communities must develop strategies for receiving and interacting with tourists as well as displaying themselves and their
Looking closely at encounters is a moral assertion that local experiences, the way they are negotiated and performed, matter to the elaboration of spatial theory and managerial plans in tourism (Caton, 2012; Mostafanezhad & Hannam, 2014). I thus propose contextualizing the complexities of managing alternative tourism through my study of Sólheimar eco-village in Paper IV.

It is my conviction that through the application of relational approaches in tourism geography, it becomes possible to unravel further some of the dynamics of managing and coping with the complexities associated with non-economic goals in tourism. These complexities are apparent in alternative tourism as the latter is developed on a background of spatial negotiations and embodied performances. It is important to reflect on the way various forms of relations come to exist, fashioning both a material and social space, in order to start proposing moral ways of thinking about lived experiences and encounters between hosts and guests. Importantly, as I will define next, bringing forward the plurality and complexity of relations characteristic of spaces of tourism ultimately means we need to reflect on the language we use to speak of them.

2.4 Imagining a World of Relations

Significant to the re-imagination of alternative tourism is a relational understanding of the spaces where social interactions occur, and how they come into being through negotiations. The agency to negotiate that relational geography concedes to its actors is significant to the imagination of moral conceptions of space (Massey, 2005; 1991). It is important to think of space as multiple, extroverted, and integrating the global and the local into one complex realm. Geographer Doreen Massey (2005; 2004; 1991), who through various publications has theorized the relationality of space, critiqued the concept of place elaborated by humanistic and structuralist geographers calling it a simplistic dualism, essentialist, limiting and omitting power relations and wider forces of inclusion and exclusion. Massey (2005; 1991), and other proponents of relational geography (see Amin 2004; 2002; Escobar, 2001; Gibson-Graham, 2004; 2003; 2002; Woods, 2007), believe it is impossible to retain any sense of a particular space in the face of increased mobility and intermixing. It is thus better to think of space as having many senses; the multiple identities of people translate into multiple spatial identities (Massey, 1991). Space is made up of constellations of social relations, meeting and weaving together to form a particular locus, including those relations with the wider world.
Before delving into the singularities and possibilities found in relational
geography, which inspired in different ways my individual papers, I want to
first highlight the post-structural nature of relational geography. Language is
crucial to highlight the relations people cultivate with each other and with
their material world in order to give them significance in social, political, and
economic discourses (Gibson-Graham & Cameron, 2007; Grimwood, 2014). In
the social sciences, post-structuralism has contributed to the creation of words,
concepts and metaphors describing processes that would have otherwise been
kept invisible without their emergence through discursive or non-
representational analysis (Gibson-Graham, 2004; 2000; Jackson, 1989; Popke,
2009). Post-structuralism had been embraced by many geographers by the
1980s, and opened up a new world of possibilities, which had been rather
unimaginable under positivism (Cresswell, 2013; Murdoch, 2006).

Post-structuralism basically solves the structuralist binary of agency
and structure by doing away with these two concepts as analytical tools,
instead wishing to scrutinize the assumptions and interplays at their very
foundation (Cresswell, 2013; Murdoch, 2006). The incursion of post-
structuralism in geography has greatly impacted the topics and methods of
interest for geographers. Geographic discourses have become more inventive
and concerned with style and form, rather than solely with the scientific rigor
it fostered before (Barnes & Duncan, 1991). The development in the social
sciences of the generation and analysis of textual meaning to understand the
world translated in an interest to engage with cultural forms, text and
interest in post-structuralism amongst geographers led to a shift of attention
towards cultural analysis, rather than economic structures, coinciding with
the ascension of cultural geography to the theoretical mainstream.

Post-structuralism can be defined as: “[...] a body of thought that insists
that ‘reality’ and ‘truth’ are an effect of what we think and do rather than a cause”
(Cresswell, 2013, p.206). Under the post-structuralist orientation, researchers
engage with the plural meanings emerging from a text and context. Essential
truths are illegitimate and replaced by ambiguity, subjectivity, instability and
uncertainty (Foucault, 1971; Smith, 2001). Going back two centuries, Friedrich
Nietzsche (1844-1900) (1954 [1873]) stated that truth is intellectually
structured, having us believe in essential meaning, and forgetting about the
violent and unfair compromising it required to become the truth (Babette,
1999; Sherratt, 2006). These concepts become our own benchmarks for truth,
and leave little place for diversity in our interpretation of the world. Echoing
Nietzsche in more current terms, Michel Foucault (1926-1984) (1980) claimed
that each society has its mechanisms to define what is true or not, and that these have been formed through various historical constraints and struggles. In this regard, understanding social phenomena requires an approach where the nature of the link between truth and power can be studied in relation to their proper context (Howarth, 2000). Though Foucault himself never appreciated being given the label of post-structuralist (see Raulet, 1983), his work is nonetheless widely considered to be at the foundation of post-structuralism, and cannot be disregarded when referring to the linguistic features of social life (Sherratt, 2006).

Foucault (1979) defines how power is transmitted through social relations in a way which forms truths over the state of society and its institutional systems. Just as a truth could not emerge without the power of a mechanism which establishes its legitimacy, power could not function without establishing truths over its legitimacy (Foucault, 1979). Truth and power are therefore inseparable as they cannot occur without the pervasive reach of the other. Foucault (1979) calls this relational process discourse (see also Howarth, 2000). Madness would not exist if we would not have created the language to conceive of it in the first place. The diagnosis is in fact a categorization where actors in positions of authority (i.e., doctors, researchers, legislators, psychologists) assign labels to medical patients to define their ailments (i.e., depressive, compulsive, psychotic). The process reaches a disciplinary form as the subject is trained to conform to normal standards, such as through taking medication or being interned at a medical facility. Eventually, the subject is meant to internalize the disciplinary process and see to her own conformation to standards of normality. In Foucault’s (1980) terms, the effects of power are subtle, and do not necessarily amount to resistance by those affected by it. Power is a productive process that normalizes behaviors and opinions so that individuals accept their state of affair. It does not belong to particular individuals, but rather is diffused through society by regimes such as schools, research institutes, clinics and media. (Foucault, 1980).

When we consider Foucault and Nietzsche’s arguments on the interplay of knowledge and power, we come to appreciate the social nature of the words and concepts we use in our daily interactions. This situation underscores the importance of the researcher’s situatedness in post-structuralist investigation (Sherratt, 2006). Social and cultural systems cannot be understood without considering the relation between those that produce knowledge, and those whom knowledge is produced about. Belhassen and Caton (2009) agree that knowledge production is a linguistic process, negotiated during conversations between stakeholders such as academics,
policy makers and study participants. What researchers produce are in fact metaphors which they feel best describe the contexts they study (Belhassen & Caton, 2009). What becomes knowledge is the interpretation of particular findings that seem most logical to those producing and disseminating it as information. Knowledge emerges from the interplay between the discursive systems put in place through such regimes as scientific communities and the localized social practices studied by these researchers. From a post-structuralist viewpoint, language is where agency is produced. Unfortunately, at times, linguistic production gives a voice to certain identities, while overlooking, or even deliberately ignoring, other identities (Spivak, 1992). It thus is important for the post-structuralist researcher to reflect on the way language is constructed in her discipline as multiple authors and subjects are involved in this process.

The proponents of post-structuralism have contributed to the emergence of radical geographies on a mission to formulate worldviews embracing the complexity and multiplicity of social identities (Cresswell, 2013; Dixon & Jones, 1998; Harrison, 2015; Murdoch, 2006). Post-structuralism gave rise to forums for discussions in geography where actors once neglected through structural and positivist theories could be given a voice (Jackson, 1989). It promoted their emancipation by revealing the symbolic forces that disempowered and disenfranchised them (Gibson-Graham, 2004; Popke, 2009). The flourishing of feminist, queer, post-colonial and moral geographies are examples of the cultural turn geography took as it embraced post-structuralism. Relational geography is a product of the post-structural ethos.

The world is no longer made of discrete things with distinct essences, rather it is formed through the ways various people, things and spaces come into being through their relations (Murdoch, 2006). These interrelations come into being through forces of competition and cooperation, shifting through time, and give spaces their unique character (Massey, 2005; 1991).

Relational geography implies that the formation of space: “[...] will always be an invention; there will be need for judgment, learning, improvisation” (Massey, 2005, p.162). The processes behind the constitution of spatial identities themselves are the matter of interest, not the essences constituting these identities. I explore these features of relational space in Paper I where I present rural tourist spaces as made up of local and extra-local networks. This approach enables us to think about spatial heterogeneity as the defining feature of any political, economic and social condition, agreeing that the relational emergence of space is both a consensual and contested process (Massey, 2005; 1991). Important to consider is Simonsen’s (2012, p.22)
contention that each individual: “[...] approaches the political as a field of forces and struggle for co-existence”. The way individuals experience social life is at the foundation of social critique (Simonsen, 2012). Maintaining a sense of human agency is crucial to a notion of relational geography engaged with ethics. Amin (2002) proposes that a relational understanding of space under globalization shifts the focus away from an uneven balance of power, onto a vision of networked space, where new voices can be heard and alternative politics advocated.

Terms embracing an ethos of relationality, reformulation and open discussion are further needed in tourism scholarship to keep uncovering and demystifying what is hidden under the surface of tourism development schemes and encounters. Gibson-Graham (2004; 2003) and Gibson-Graham and Cameron (2007) encourage putting into words the non-capitalist ways in which we are connected. They write: “Given the impoverished field of economic possibility, the ethical practice of subject formation requires cultivating our capacities to imagine, desire and practice noncapitalist ways to be” (Gibson-Graham, 2003, p.54). This implies considering the other ways people are involved in the economy, such as within their households and community organizations, and through volunteer work, barter, collective enterprises, and so on. The message to take is that by focusing on naming the effects of globalization at the performative and contextual level, we avoid the colonization of our imagination by a unique imaginary (Gibson-Graham, 2004).

Tourism geography has progressed conceptually and theoretically through the adoption of various post-structuralist approaches during its critical and cultural turns of the past decades (Gale, 2012). It can evidently progress further from these approaches. For example, Grimwood’s (2014) elaboration of new relational metaphors to speak of tourism more fairly in indigenous contexts is an example of how a relational approach can be related to morality. By acknowledging embodied experiences of the Arctic through new relational terms (i.e., emplacement, wayfaring and gathering), the contemporary livelihoods of the Inuit people Grimwood (2014) speaks of are made to matter in the articulation of tourism discourses. Belhassen and Caton (2009, p.343) call such words “[...] discursive anchors around which academic conversation can progress”. The authors name authenticity and community as such terms, stating these words do not have a single definition, but rather serve to fuel conversation amongst tourism scholars around their various meanings and implications (Belhassen & Caton, 2009).

I now showcase two concepts, based in relational understandings of space, which I see as discursive anchors that can help scholars advance
discussions of local experiences in tourism geography. I refer to these two concepts as: *dwelling*, as imagined by Tim Ingold (2011), and *sincerity*, as proposed by John Taylor (2001). Both these scholars are in fact anthropologists, but their work is significant to a relational conception of social space and to the management of encounters. *Dwelling* is featured in Paper II and *sincerity* in Paper III. These two concepts ultimately reflect the salience of the post-structural ontology of re-imagining social and material relations, and have guided me in my elaboration of new terms to speak of alternatives and morals in tourism.

2.4.1 Dwelling

The adoption of post-structuralism in geography has enabled the dismantling of social structures and their symbolic meaning (Creswell, 2013; Murdoch, 2006). However, for some scholars, this mere dismantling was not radical enough. Post-structuralist approaches were criticized for not doing away completely away with the tyranny of structures and their impingement on social life in their deconstruction of discourses, symbols and texts (Massey, 2000; Rose, 2002). To conceptualize the world with as few of these structures as possible, some scholars went even further in reimagining the world around them. As touched upon earlier in the description of the performance turn in tourism, increasing attention in human geography is given to varied notions of performance relating to practice, materiality and embodied agency (Wylie, 2007). All of these processes are central to relational thinking. A shift towards a more performative notion of space has been seen mostly as a critique of deeply intellectual ways of thinking about the world in terms of signs, structures and symbols (Thrift & Dewsbury, 2000). Geographer Nigel Thrift (2008; 2004; 2000; 1996) was seeking a deeper re-conceptualization of space in geographic theory when he proposed what he called non-representational theory. Instead of seeing space as a container of action, Thrift (2008; 2004; 2000; 1996) argues that space is produced through performative moments. Non-representational theory worked well as a critique to the primacy of text and discourse which disregards that the world is in a constant state of becoming, filled with moments of creativity and liveliness (Thrift, 2008; 2004; 2000; 1996).

This is not to say that representation can be completely dismissed from social analysis. It is impossible not to give names and form categories as we express ourselves through language. Rather, representation is to be seen as performative in itself, as part of a realm of embodied practices and performances that situate the subject as *in* and *of* the world (Dewsbury, Wylie, Harrison & Rose, 2002). In my work, I thus conceive of non-representational
theory as Geographer Hayden Lorimer (2005) did when he coined the term *more than representational* theory. This precision in the term is used to avoid the misconception that we can do away completely with representation. As Lorimer (2005) asserts, the researcher now seeks to give meaning to performance and practice in her portrayal of the world. In his words: “The focus falls on how life takes shape and gains expression in shared experiences, everyday routines, fleeting encounters, embodied movements, precognitive triggers, practical skills, affective intensities, enduring urges, unexceptional interactions and sensuous dispositions” (Lorimer, 2005, p.84). Instead of uncovering meaning and assigning value to human action, the researcher focuses on the material compositions and conducts of what she sees (Dewsbury et al., 2002).

McCormack (2008) notes that certain activities find their meaning in tangible corporeality of individual expressions that cannot be explained through a conventional representational frame. With non-representational theory, the aim is ultimately to imagine new frames of reference to speak of people’s involvement in the world (Lorimer, 2005).

I suggest, in Paper II, that corporeal ways of being involved in tourist landscapes can be revealed through the non-representational concept of dwelling. The dwelling perspective, established by Tim Ingold (2011), exemplifies the formation of new language to imagine embodied subjectivity and its effect on space. Maurice Merleau-Ponty’s (1962 [1945]) notion of a body that inhabits space and time, rather than merely finds itself in space and time, is central to the dwelling perspective (Ingold, 2011). Opposing the mind and body dichotomy, Merleau-Ponty (1962 [1945]) argues that the body is not to be seen as an object, but rather as the condition and context which enables one to have a relation with the objects of the world. Human performance is the result of embodied practices that contain transformative elements that can fashion space in enduring ways (Cloke & Jones, 2001). Ingold (2011) was also inspired by Martin Heidegger’s (1889-1975) (1971) phenomenology, where humans inhabit their world through their ongoing practices. By inhabiting space, humans make the latter meaningful, a realm of daily involvement, where they both find their way and feel at home (Simonsen, 2012). Dwelling implies people extract resources over time through various mundane practices, build and refashion structures, form institutions and hold bonds of different nature and strength with their material space and its other inhabitants, human and non-human alike.

Ingold (2011) proposes that landscapes arise from the practical activities of those who dwell therein. This formulation implies a landscape is formed through movements of incorporation. The processes that give rise to
human activity weave themselves in the environment, evoking that: “[...] the landscape is constituted as an enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves” (Ingold, 2011: 189). This process of incorporation is what Ingold (2011) considered to be embodiment. Incorporation differs from inscription whereby a cultural template is used to give meaning to landscapes.

A hunter knows how to track prey because of repeated immersion in the noises, compositions and smells of the forest. This knowledge comes from the inhabitation of a space, not because of learning through text or imagery.

The notion of dwelling in a landscape implies that humans have a connection to a material world (Ingold, 2011). A consideration of materiality gives objects a form of agency that entangles them in the realm of the social (Latour, 1996; Whatmore, 2002). Whatmore (2002) explains that materials foremost have their own agency which affords us bodily capabilities by enabling certain performances. Whatmore (2002) argues that the substance of human and non-human bodies are not solely the receptacle of social retro-projection; they are also the vehicle of performances in the social ordering. This must not be misunderstood to mean that objects have the same agency as human subjects, acquiring agency through their movements, or by being moved around by outside forces: “An actant can literally be anything provided it is granted to be the source of action” (Latour, 1996, p.373). Non-humans stimulate reactions amongst social beings. It is the relation between the human and non-human that becomes significant as performance stems from there.

Popke (2009) believes that these accounts of how we construct and perform our world in relation to each other and with other non-humans enables us to conceive of our position in the world differently. When we see the world as ongoing fluxes of becoming, our attention is directed towards hybridity and corporeality (Whatmore, 2002). The webs of connections we foster within our material world are based in discursive as well as corporeal actions which orient our senses in the world (Ingold, 2011; Simonsen, 2012). As we are made aware of how non-humans and spaces are brought into being through our relations to them, we can enact our responsibilities towards them (Hinchliffe & Whatmore, 2006; Popke, 2009; Whatmore, 2002). By raising the conceptual possibilities found in applying the dwelling perspective, I explore in Paper II some of the multiple and fluid identities of things and beings situated in relation to each other in the tourist landscape. I contend that a conception of tourist spaces as realms of dwelling makes us more attuned to the different possibilities that emanate from living in close relation to tourism.
2.4.2 Sincerity

In the past, some scholars have tended to view tourism as the perpetrator of a negative dominant culture of consumption patterns, habits and prejudice, where guests end up imposing their subjectivity on their host (Wearing & Wearing, 2006; McCannell, 1992). This view of tourism has mostly lost currency with the emergence of relational ways of thinking about space and culture as both hybrid and dynamic (Hollinshead, 2009; Meethan, 2003; 2001). To view tourism as the perpetrator of discourses of subordination does not benefit local actors negotiating their way through the development of tourism (Milne & Ateljevic, 2001). Cultural groups are open to certain re-figuration and influences brought about by tourism, making hybridity a central concept to the conceptualization of tourist spaces and their people (Amoamo, 2011; Hollinshead, 2009; 1998; Oakes, 1999; 1993). Cultural changes occur through a transformative process where dominant discourses are challenged and reformulated as they materialize locally; blurring new and old identities in complex and unpredictable manners (Meethan, 2003; 2001).

Wearing and Wearing (2006) hold that the integration of tourism to local strategies should promote the emergence of a spatial hybridity positive to the host-community. Werbner (1997, p.5) calls such hybridity a deliberate deployment of culture meant to: “[…] shock, change, challenge, revitalize or disrupt through deliberate intended fusions of unlike social languages and images”. Amoamo (2011) studied Maori operators who select, recollect and present their own stories of their colonial past along with their modern day context as post-colonial agents by taking tourists on alternative tours. These tours are used to showcase Maori culture as dynamic and adapted to the global economy. Amoamo (2011) thus identifies a new space where a hybrid culture takes precedence over one frozen in primitive times. The assertion of cultural hybridity in tourism is demonstrated to be a strategic instrument to deal with discourses and structures of globalization (Amoamo, 2011).

Of interest in Paper III, John Taylor (2001) proposes the cultivation of negotiations between host and guest over the meaning of their cultural encounter, which he defines as a gesture of sincerity. MacCannell (1976) famously coined the term staged-authenticity, implying that there is a back-stage to tourism where the host’s culture is more authentic than what is staged for consumption. The popularity of alternative forms of tourism related to cultural encounters, such as volunteer tourism, attest to a growing interest amongst tourists to live back-stage experiences. However, cultures, as well as their authenticity, are social constructions influenced by an array of interrelations (Wang, 1999). It is problematic for host communities to display
true essences to please tourists (Taylor, 2001). For instance, Conran (2011) criticizes the search for back-stage authenticity amongst volunteer tourists stating that it creates a contrived notion of intimacy where tourists are left searching for cultural essences and interpersonal bonds. The volunteers’ search for intimacy during such cultural encounters overshadows the structural inequalities at the core of their relationships, and denies the host her own critical voice (Conran, 2011). In light of this shortcoming, Taylor (2001, p.23) innovatively presents his conception of sincerity in his discussion of cultural tourism, saying: “The notion of sincerity is significantly different from that of authenticity in that it occurs in the zone of contact among participating groups or individuals, rather than appearing as an internal quality of a thing, self, or Other”. Sincerity is, for Taylor (2001), about moving away from the deceit of essences and representations. An interest in sincerity implies an openness to let communication between host and guest flourish where values and identities can be negotiated (Taylor, 2001).

Sincerity, as I present it in Paper II, is meant to direct attention towards the possible ways hosts and guests can attentively meet through alternative tourism at the eco-community. I wish to propose that sincerity is an assertion that tourist encounters can be imagined in creative and dynamic ways. Sincerity can be linked to alternative community development as it implies a form of management of host and guest encounters based in social exchange. In the case studied by Amoamo (2011), the alternative narratives presented to tourists are organized as objects of communication and negotiation, forming realistic pathways for this cultural group’s development. Gibson-Graham (2004; 2003) and Gibson-Graham and Cameron (2007) argue that the theorization of alternative local development can be used to see the multiple openings that provide space for new possibilities. An interest for sincerity in alternative tourism at the eco-community is not a suggestion to re-imagine global economic and political systems in provoking ways. The global capitalist system cannot idealistically be dismantled and replaced to foster unproblematic encounters between hosts and guests, but communication between the two stakeholders can be fruitful. The search for drastic utopian mentality reflects that often the sustainability of social endeavors and community projects are judged in unrealistic terms (Gibson-Graham & Cameron, 2007). In Paper III, what I seek to unravel with the concept of sincerity is rather a re-imagination of how we define the successes and failures of alternative solutions in terms more sensitive to the relational nature of spaces and local cultures.
3 Research Design

As I became a doctoral student, I was given the exciting, yet very challenging, task of putting together my own research project. I have thus chosen my case studies and their methodologies myself. The two cases I am about to present are related to places I have grown very fond of through my own travels. Visiting them as a researcher with a baggage of critical theories made me see these places in a different way, but did not suppress my interest to learn more about their people. I relate their selection to their unusual features in an attempt to bring new stories forward, but also to the salience of studying the type of alternatives they foster in their integration of tourism. These cases, anchored in the northern European context, are: rural tourism and the craft-artists of Bornholm, Denmark (Papers I and II) and volunteer tourism at Sólheimar eco-village, Iceland (Papers III and IV) (see Figure 1 for the locations of the two case studies).

It was obvious from the beginning that I would need qualitative methods of inquiry to research these cases with the ambition of understanding their people’s experiences of tourism. In this chapter, I explain why I chose to work with narratives (Papers I and II) and ethnography (Papers III and IV), and the implications of these modes of analysis for my research process. As for the data collection, I describe in detail how I went about collecting interviews and participant observation through different sets of fieldwork. This description is essential to inform the reader in the best way possible as to how I formed my conclusions. It is important to consider the constructed nature of knowledge in science, and therefore I leave the last sub-section of this chapter to methodological considerations. These thoughts are related to my positionality and the validation process of qualitative inquiry in the post-structuralist realm of thinking.

3.1 Case Selection

Both my cases are paradigmatic to the re-ordering of socio-economic lives towards tourism development highlighted in my theoretical chapter. Paradigmatic cases function as reference points to the characteristics of society, and can support the establishment of schools of thoughts (Flyvberg, 2006). In both instances, I have chosen to work with cases that reflect the complex nature of tourist encounters in spaces meant to represent and foster different types of alternatives in the northern European context. My selection of my cases, in terms of their applicability to my research questions, is twofold.
Firstly, to open up to the complexity of tourism as a lived phenomenon for the host, I favored the peculiar in my selection of craft-art and rural tourism on Bornholm. Secondly, to contribute to the field of tourism through critical thinking and re-conceptualizations, I chose the case of Sólheimar eco-village where I studied host-guest encounters in volunteer tourism.

Case studies as a method of inquiry are practical to investigate real-life phenomena occurring within contemporary bounded systems (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2009). As I seek an in-depth analysis of the relations that shape spaces and lived experiences, methods that enable me to assess closely social and spatial features are necessary. Proximity to reality is a prerequisite to learn about it, and the case study approach offers that possibility. Flyvbjerg (2006, p.224) explains that: “Predictive theories and universals cannot be found in the study of human affairs”. It thus becomes important to access first-hand this reality where narratives, perspectives and behaviors which characterize social action come together (Flyvbjerg, 2006). My two case studies are to be seen as in-depth involvements with two different social context in order to bring forward a diversity of clues and impressions over the complex and multiple realities of living with tourism, especially while fostering non-economic goals.

Figure 1: The location of the two case studies in northern Europe (Map by Arie Stoffelen at KU Leuven, 2017)
Case study research is not only appropriate when it can be used for generalizing theoretical and conceptual applications (Eckstein, 1992; Flyvberg, 2006). In this regard, two points must be remembered. First, case studies can be used to falsify theoretical assumptions, instead of only aim at generalizing (Eckstein, 1992; Flyvberg, 2006). By carefully selecting a critical case with strategic relevance to the research questions of the study, the researcher can go on finding theoretical inconsistencies in her context of study, provoking the revision or rejection of a theory. Falsification is a rigorous scientific method, which Karl Popper (1959) presented to avoid the researcher bias stemming from verification. With falsification, instead of looking for the signs that will confirm one’s theory, the researcher is interested in the signs that will disprove its generalization (Popper, 1959). This strategy implies that choosing a case that is at first glance likely to fit a theory can instead be used to find how it does not (Eckstein, 1992; Flyvberg, 2006).

My selection of Sólheimar eco-village to study host-guest interactions in volunteer tourism is such a case study (Papers III and IV). If even in this ideal community, intentionally formed through social and environmental goals of sharing and learning, there are tensions in the management of volunteering guests, there must be managerial tensions in other lesser ideal community-contexts of volunteer tourism. Through this case study, falsification can become a form of generalization.

Sólheimar eco-village, Iceland is where about a hundred individuals live and work. This is a community whose ideal of sustainability is reflected in its goals of social integration for adults with mental handicaps, local economic subsistence and promotion of sustainable best-practices and environmental education (Bang, 2002). Residents with a mental handicap compose about forty-five percent of the village’s population. They are employed at the different businesses and workshops that have flourished at Sólheimar over the years, or at other positions around the villages. Their tasks correspond to their abilities, and are meant to stimulate feelings of self-worth and inclusion. Individuals without a mental-handicap fulfill administrative and coordinative duties, and have to adapt to the form of organization the disabled residents necessitate. The village receives long-term guests all year round, through different volunteer, internship and student programs, to help at its workshops, and businesses, including its educational center (see Figure 6). There are six artisanal workshops producing wood works, wool works, soaps, candles, ceramics and art made mostly of organic materials (see Figure 2). The businesses are: an organic greenhouse, a tree nursery and a center for sustainability and environmental education built in 2002 (see Figure 7).
Volunteer tourism is a popular research topic in tourism scholarship, most likely due to its increasing popularity amongst young travelers in the recent years (Wearing & McGehee, 2013). Community volunteer tourism is arguably the form of tourism that solicits the closest form of encounter between host and guest as the latter is invited to share the same space as her host in the hope of gaining a profound cultural learning experience (Wearing, 2001). The problematic explored by scholars often revolves around the commodified nature of sending out privileged youth to experience poverty and exotic lifestyles, while the latter does very little to actually contribute to lasting local development (Guttentag, 2009; Palacios, 2010). These dynamics are characteristic of cases in the global South, which are out of the geographical scope of this thesis. In Paper III, I relate the situation of Sólheimar to the organic farm experience, where hosts open their homes to guests who are willing to provide free labour in exchange of helping out with the eco-friendly business. I do this to highlight the position of the eco-village in a developed context and its ambition to provide a learning experience to guests on top of having them contribute to their welfare. Cases investigating alternative space like an eco-community or family farm in developed contexts have mostly been used to conceptualize the positive aspects of this type of volunteer tourism (see Kosnik, 2014; Miller & Mair, 2015; 2014; Terry, 2014).

Figure 2: Creations from the wood workshop at Sólheimar
(Photo by Solène Prince, 2010)
Opening up the alternative community in the developed world to more scrutiny is thus of interest in the study of volunteer tourism. Papers III and IV narrow down on management issues that creep up on the host due to the intrinsic nature of offering a volunteer tourism experience where service and comfort are juxtaposed to hard labor.

The second point to remember about case study research is that the narratives extracted from the case are in themselves meant to be a rich source of valuable information (Flyvberg, 2006). It thus becomes interesting to look for cases that are rich in content and social action, regardless of concerns with generalization of how typical or average these are in relation to a wider context (MacLure, 2013). The more actors involved in a context, and the more diverse these are, represents an interesting chance for increased insight into the processes that make up social life. In my case study on the arts and craft community on Bornholm in Denmark, I was interested in investigating the peculiarity of an art cluster thriving on tourism in the countryside (Paper I). Tourism in the countryside is usually related to food and drink production. This case thus brings a new perspective to the fore. Important to keep in mind is that this countryside is a hybrid space, displaying the complex spatial interrelations discussed by Massey (2005; 1991), which link it to global processes and problematize its definition as an essentially rural space (Heley

Figure 3: Svaneka, Bornholm, during the tourist season
(Photo by Solène Prince, 2011)
& Jones, 2012; McCarthy, 2008; Woods, 2009; 2007). Bornholm, with its population of 39 829 permanent residents (Statistics Denmark, 2016), hosts around 750 000 tourists during its summer tourist season (Larsen & Rømer, 2013) (see Figure 3). The experiences and ambitions of the members of its arts and craft community thus represent an attractive case to study tourism in a complex context of local and global interactions. With this case study, I also follow MacLure’s (2013, p.660) proposition to: “[…] acknowledge that data have their ways of making themselves intelligible to us”. In this regard, the researcher should go towards the moments that she finds interesting during her data collection. It is with this spirit that I turned to non-representational ways of analyzing space in my study of craft-art and rural tourism on Bornholm (Paper II).

A case reflecting the multiple aspirations and challenges faced by those tangled in the production of a rural tourist space is salient to a discussion on coping strategies and spatial dynamics in tourism. It has become a significant field of interest in tourism research to gain insight on the structures and potential of tourism to generate development in European regions lagging in development due to economic restructuring (see Saxena & Ilbery, 2010; Saxena, Clark & Oliver, 2007; Oliver & Jenkins, 2003). Bornholm underwent major economic restructuring where several European and national programs were implemented, starting in the 1990s, to counter the island’s collapsed economy. Many of these incentives were aimed at boosting the tourism industry (Ioannides & Petersen, 2003; 2001). The restructuring stimulated the development of various micro-businesses involved mostly with specialized foods, hospitality, and handcrafts, which now characterize Bornholm’s economy and destination brand (Ioannides & Petersen, 2003; 2001; Manniche & Larsen, 2013). In the early 2000s, the development of the arts and craft cluster garnered attention from local politicians who were seeking to boost tourism on Bornholm by branding the Hasle municipality as a center for craft-art. This sparked the grassroots formation in 2002 of the Arts and Crafts Association Bornholm (ACAB). Interestingly, the ACAB is meant to provide a competitive advantage to its members on the international craft scene and during their island’s intensive tourist season by enabling them to pool resources.

The complex web of relations created through regional development on Bornholm is a significant element to the study of rural tourism. Rural tourism is usually associated with place-based experiences related to rural infrastructure of production and processing (Lane, 2009a; Sharpley, 2004). Importantly, the rural space is not just a physical space, but also comes into
existence through signs and symbols related to particular traditional practices, products and lifestyles embedded within the notion of rurality (Ray, 1998; Kneafsey, 2001). One of the most compelling image of rural spaces in the European context is the rural idyll, implying a space of peace, spirituality and tranquility (Avraham, 2003; Bunce, 2003; Jepson & Sharpley, 2015; Shields, 1991; Short, 2006). As I explore in Paper I, the production of arts and crafts also enters imaginaries of idyllic rurality sought after by its inhabitants and by the tourists looking for sites of localized hand-made and small-scale production, opposite to the fast-paced and standardized elements of the traditionally urban space (see also Prince, 2017d) (see Figures 4 and 5).

3.2 Methodology

The appropriate methods of inquiry and analysis for my study were those that enabled me to capture relational experiences of living with tourism. Caton (2012) encourages tourism researchers to always ponder on the purpose and effects of their research. This argument is shared with other tourism scholars concerned over ethical and moral research (see Tribe, Xiao & Chambers, 2012; Feighery, 2011; Tribe, 2009). I use social research to look into the managerial and negotiated complexity of systems where the non-economic and economic activities and ambitions of local individuals take centre stage in creating tourist spaces. This focus on lived experience is done in the hope of avoiding to overly reduce local involvement to behavioral models, scientific theories and intellectual critique. Such conception of scientific knowledge risks severing research from the world of the living by dehumanizing its subjects, and consequently losing public appeal (Ingold, 2011; Thrift, 2001). Besides promoting the creation of new knowledge and understanding, social research can also attempt at fostering compassion and connectedness between the lived and academic world (Freeman, 2004).

A focus on local experiences arguably calls for: “More interpretive techniques, such as ethnography, open-ended interviews and focus groups, which enable participants to speak from their own perspective” (Ateljevic, 2000, p.382). Understanding is as vital as explanation, if not more, when a study revolves around different facets of social life (Freeman, 2004). It was thus important for me as a researcher to look into stories, cultural encounters, daily practices, and spatial visual and material assemblages at the heart of local experiences. The two interpretive techniques I used are: narratives for the case of Bornholm’s craft artists (Papers I and II), and focused ethnography at Sólheimar eco-village (Papers III and IV). It will become apparent that these two techniques are for researchers interested in finding data everywhere.
3.2.1 Narratives

Narrative research is about collecting stories from individuals about their experiences, lived and told, in order to shed light on their identities, in an attempt to understand how these individuals see themselves (Creswell, 2013). Narrative research is a vehicle for understanding the particular features of the lives of individuals, and therefore also provides insight on social reality (Freeman, 2004). Czarniawska (2004, p.17) holds that: “Narrative is understood as a spoken or written text giving an account of an event/action or series of events/actions, chronologically connected”. Narratives have an episodic dimension where time becomes linear, just as human experience. The stories forming a narrative are compiled to foster a sense of understanding, and thus are more about suggesting social possibilities than about convincing readers of a definitive truth. Freeman (2004, p.79) therefore believes that narrative research is a: “[…] project of articulating and explicating meaning”. Narrative analysis is guided by the nature of the phenomenon, where attention is given to what is interesting and worth saying about a situation (Freeman, 2004).

Freeman (2004, p.64) concedes that narrative research is used: “[…] to practice greater fidelity to the reality of human experience and thereby to tell a more truthful story about it”. The stories of interest to narrative research are central to human experience, and relate to the multitude of lived moments that appear as comedy, tragedy, chaos, shock, happiness, disappointment, beauty, and so on. (Freeman, 2004). Truthfulness implies forming understanding through the collection of rich data. The accumulation of narrative data goes beyond the traditional in-depth interview focused solely on a dialogue between interviewer and interviewee. An interest in narratives implies also looking outside the interview context into the realm of involvement of those studied as it is a chance to gather data related to people’s lives. Data is everywhere for the researcher interested in life itself. It is found in everyday encounters with those around us (Freeman, 2004). It therefore becomes important for the researcher interested in narratives to be attentive to the particularities and regularities of social life as it happens. In-place methodologies situating conversations and observations in the emotional and active realm of the participant better reveals these types of lived-experiences (Anderson & Jones, 2009; Anderson, 2004; Bondi, 2005; Nash, 2000). In their work, Anderson and Jones (2009, p.300) found that in-place methodologies helped access: “[…] languages that recalled more detailed emotional and embodied experiences” as study participants were approached in their social contexts of everyday life.
3.2.2 Focused Ethnography

When it comes to studying tourists, an ethnographic approach is complicated as it is difficult to maximize time with individuals with transitory identities and mobile bodies (Frohlick & Harrison, 2008). In the case of volunteer tourism, nonetheless, it is quite common for researchers to resort to spending extended periods of time in a community to study hosts and their guests (see Hammersley, 2014; MacIntosh & Zahra, 2007; Mostafanezhad, 2014). Put simply, ethnography is about the study of social and cultural patterns within an entire defined culture-sharing group (Creswell, 2013). Wolcott (2008) explains that the ethnographer is interested in identifying patterns of social behavior and organization, and shared cultural and ethical values. The ethnographer will therefore look at the material activities and language used by the cultural group under study (Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott, 2008). This is executed in order to form a novel understanding of a group of which little is known, resulting in the development of a cultural interpretation (Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott, 2008).

Ethnography is not only to be used in a classic anthropological sense, where remote societies are studied through the extensive presence of a social researcher in an exotic field. Increasingly, the socio-cultural patterns found in workplaces, schools, and various other social contexts have become topics of interest for ethnographers (Wall, 2015). Tourists positioned as objects of ethnographic investigation also attest to this type of research interest (see Frohlick, 2008; Harrison, 2008; Mathers, 2008). This type of ethnography, looking at groups in emerging cultural contexts, is sometimes called focused ethnography. Focused ethnography revolves around the study of emerging cultural contexts where patterns of behaviors are found in individuals with common perspectives, goals, sub-cultures and social affinities, rather than in a cultural group that differs completely from the researcher in a cultural sense (Knoblauch, 2005; Wall, 2015). A focused ethnography moreover implies the researcher enters the field with specific research questions guiding her observations, rather than with the aim of broadly observing a cultural group (Knoblauch, 2005; Wall, 2015). This enables ethnographic research to make valuable contributions to social science in diverse and creative ways.

Regardless of its form and specificity of its aim, ethnography implies immersion in the daily lives of people belonging to a sociocultural-sharing group (Fetterman, 2010; Wolcott, 2008). Participant observations, coupled with other methods such as interviews and document analysis, are used to collect relevant information (Creswell, 2013). Creswell (2013) notes the qualitative validation process implies prolonged engagement and persistent
observation in the field in order to build an informed picture of the situation. It becomes crucial for the researcher to sustain and maximize contact with the study participants in their cultural settings during the ethnographic fieldwork. The success of ethno-methodologies such as participant observation therefore rests in the ability of the researcher to foster positive social relations with the study subjects (Amit, 2000).

Many ethnographic researchers include the practice of listening in their active engagement, where conversation is as important as observation during the immersion process (Forsey, 2010; Hockey, 2002). Onsite informal conversations are important to the appreciation of the subject’s perspective (Belsky, 2004). Frohlick & Harrison (2008) write that it is the researcher’s complex entanglement with tourist and tourist spaces that enables her to understand tourist experiences and subjectivities as she participates in these realms of involvement beyond mere observation. Similarly, Hammersley (2014) argues that community membership and the researcher status are complimentary, rather than contradictory, during ethnographic data collection. Hammersley (2014, p.861) describes her research as: “[…] based on a sense of mutual understanding and shared confidence between the researcher and research participant”. The ethnographer thus finds methodological depth by being a sympathetic ear to her study participants (Frohlick & Harrison, 2008).

3.3 Data Collection

3.3.1 Bornholm’s Craft-artists

I have been twice on Bornholm to do fieldwork for my doctoral research; once for two weeks in the fall of 2013, and again in the fall of 2014 for five weeks. I chose the autumn period to do my two sets of fieldwork because it is then that the tourist season winds down on Bornholm, leaving time for craft-artists and other stakeholders to participate in interviews. However, the tourist season was not completely over, and thus it made it possible for me to gather first-hand observations at local galleries, museums, boutiques and events, before most of them closed down for the winter. The observations and informal conversations I gathered during my fieldwork were used to complement the interviews, and were therefore noted down as part of my field notes.

Using contextual interviews seemed to be the most appropriate way to gather the narratives that interested me in the case of Bornholm’s craft-artists. The contextual aspect was important in order to situate conversations and observations in the emotional and active realms of the participants (Anderson, 2004; Anderson & Jones, 2009; Bondi, 2005; Nash, 2000). Visiting people in
their homes and workplaces generated a personal atmosphere where I felt like I entered their world. Visiting these individuals in their realm of involvement meant I was often given tours and explanations about their creative work and the techniques they used. It led to a lot of off-topic discussions on matters related to craft-art. This interest became more than a mere strategy to get people (including myself) at ease before the real interviewing started as the information I heard from these moments became very compelling to me. I had to discard these moments when I wrote Paper I, but I wanted to present them as meaningful to the study of tourism, and this is why I wrote a second article (Paper II) focused on materiality and practice in the tourist landscape.

I interviewed at their workshops, boutiques or homes nineteen of the sixty-four members that composed the ACAB at the time of my research. I found the contact information of the ACAB members on their association’s homepage. My first round of fieldwork was used to gather preliminary data on this group. Therefore, the craft-artists I contacted at that time for an interview were meant to form a representative sample of the members of the association, considering their various medium, experiences and ambitions. I was able to interview one potter, three glass designers and five ceramists. The ceramists represent the largest proportion of craft-artists in the association, and so it was natural that I interviewed more of them during both sets of fieldwork.

I also enhanced this study with interviews with two key actors in the promotion of the arts and tourism on Bornholm during my first round of fieldwork. Those were: the director of the Bornholm Art Museum (who is also a member of the jury determining ACAB membership), and an officer at Destination Bornholm, the island’s official tourist association. The interview of the officer at Destination Bornholm was actually carried out as part of a destination planning course at the master’s level given by my home university. I was kindly allowed to be involved in this practical part of the course due to my interest in Bornholm. I gathered information at this seminar by listening to her presentation of tourism on Bornholm, and participating in the session for questions. This seminar helped me understand tourism dynamics on Bornholm and clued me in on the development of arts and crafts on the island. The director of the Art Museum provided insightful information about the historical development of craft art on Bornholm and its current status. Though these interviews do not figure concretely in my findings, both were important in gaining background information that would help me contextualize the dynamics of tourism and craft art on the island.
Once I finished my first round of fieldwork and was back at my home institution, I started working on my exploratory findings to prepare for my second round of fieldwork. I contacted each craft-artist of the ACAB that I had not yet interviewed by email. As with the first round of emails, I shortly stated my interest and status as a researcher. Through my emails, I again approached the craft-artists in an informal manner, asking to meet them wherever suited them to speak about their art. Each message was personalized to convey interest and create a rapport of confidence with the participants. In order to generate as much of a representative sample as possible, I contacted some particular non-responsive individuals twice or approached them in person instead. The individuals I interviewed during my second round of fieldwork turned out to be: two glass designers, one woodworker, one textile designer, one knitwear designer and five ceramists. After this total of nineteen interviews, I had reached a point of saturation in my data collection where the information from respondents formed distinct patterns.

Within the overall sample used for this article, three of the glass-artists, with two of them working as partners, ran full-fledged businesses providing them with full-time employment. These glass-artists have their designs
outsourced and/or reproduced by employees. The rest of the craft-artists interviewed chose other strategies to pursue craft-art, such as taking on a second job or subsisting from the earnings of a spouse. The artists not running businesses are represented to capture the whole spectrum of that experience; from those who work other jobs, to those for whom their craft-art is viable. Three of these craft-artists are originally from Bornholm. The others moved to the island either for professional reasons, to follow a spouse or because of the appeal of the place. Fifteen are of Danish origin, while the others are as follows: one of Japanese, one of Swedish, one of American and one of German origin. All study participants, like most of the craft-artists on Bornholm who are members of the ACAB, permanently live on the island. I also tried to interview participants from different locations on Bornholm to capture a comprehensive picture of the different experiences amongst the ACAB members as the localities around Bornholm differ in their touristic appeal.

Four were from the capital Ronne, one from Allinge, four from Ro, two from Nyker, two from Nexø, four from Svanæke and two from Gudhjem (see detailed maps and an interview table in Papers I and II).

I used two main questions to guide my study, which I could explore more in depth with open-ended questions during the interviews (see appendix 8.1). These main questions were related to: what does it mean to be a crafts person on Bornholm, and, how is it to live with the tourist season? As I was interested in extracting information on the everyday practices of my respondents to form narratives on the meaning of their actions, the interview questions subsequently centered on their everyday practices, where I asked, for example: How did you establish yourself on Bornholm? What do you like about living here as a craft-artist? What is challenging? Who are your customers? How is the ACAB helpful for you? The interviews lasted on average an hour and were recorded with permission of the participants.

I transcribed the interviews from the first round of fieldwork as soon as it was completed. I thus had the time to assess my preliminary findings before going in the field again. During the second set of fieldwork, I started transcribing my interviews during my data collection. This enabled me to constantly sharpen my questions of inquiry as I interviewed my participants. I took notes after each interview to capture the context of each respondent. This was done to strengthen the validity of the data analysis process (Creswell, 2013). I did all the interviews in English, which did not pose any significant problem since the participants were mostly proficient in the language. My knowledge of Swedish, a language similar to Danish, helped to solve some minor confusions. I analyzed the data to form narratives about the meaning
of these participants’ actions and thoughts. After many readings of transcripts and field notes, I formed the analytical categories of Papers I and II.

I gave my interview participants pseudonyms to preserve their anonymity. I informed the participants before every interview that I would give them pseudonyms in my research. It did not seem to be a great matter of concern to them. The topics covered were not overly sensitive, but anonymity is usually used in research out of concern for the participants. I did not do any formal member-checking towards the end of my study. Member checking entails approaching the participants for their perspective on the credibility of the researcher’s interpretation (Creswell, 2013). I judged member-checking unnecessary because I had tested my conclusions throughout the interview process with my participants, and even with other actors encountered during fieldwork. This was done, first, with my preliminary study, and, second, with my transcription during data collection, which all led to a constant cycle of checking and refining my interpretation of my findings during fieldwork.

3.3.2 Sólheimar Eco-village

To study Sólheimar, I conducted focused ethnographic research during a six-week period in early 2015. My research targeted the interactions of the volunteers and community members as the latter seeks to benefit and educate these guests. This led me to perform focused observations, instead of trying to interpret the whole register of interactions between the two parties. I chose the ethnographic method because I wanted to study social interactions in their actual occurrence. I gathered most of my data through on-site informal conversational interviews during daily activities at the eco-village where I approached volunteers, visitors, students and community members alike in their context of experience (i.e., their workplace, and social spaces such as the lunch hall, at morning meetings, and community events of all sorts), when it seemed appropriate. I used more formal interviews to collect my data in some instances during fieldwork. It was important to sustain maximum contact with the different actors at the village of interest for my study. I found myself constantly observing, discussing, and writing down field notes.

My stay in 2015 was in fact my third visit to the village, and my second extended stay in the community. I firstly integrated the Sólheimar community for three months in the fall of 2010 as an intern looking for academic credits at the master’s level. As an intern, I worked on educative projects and worked at the organic greenhouse, and other places around the village in order to contribute to its livelihood. I also participated in a variety
of local activities such as communal lunches, morning meetings and social events as interns and volunteers are expected to do to contribute to the community’s social well-being. As I considered using Sólheimar as a case study for my doctoral project, I shortly visited the community again to share my interest and ideas with key individuals. This was a way to ask for permission to join the community and study it. I offered to write a report for the coordinators of the volunteers and interns in order to help them in the development of their intern program and the management of their volunteers. This prospect of exchange was well received, and I was able to integrate the community as a researcher. I was eventually given a list of emails and access to previous reports to compile information that could be helpful to these coordinators about their volunteering guests. I saw the task of writing this report as a way to give back to the community as a researcher.

My contact to the fifteen guests that volunteered at Sólheimar during my fieldwork was facilitated by my integration in the community as what could be considered one of them. I shared their accommodation (for convenience), worked as a volunteer around the village (for observations), and was around their age and foreign like them. It became relatively easy to sustain positive social relations with them. I could thus easily observe them and approach them with questions during my fieldwork. They were aware of my researcher status, and could feel free to discuss my topics of research with me from their perspective. More specifically, I observed the volunteers at their workplaces during three working days in total helping at the bakery and four working days in total helping at the greenhouse. As I had office space at the educational center, I could regularly observe the volunteers involved there during working hours. Many observations of the volunteers were done on a daily basis in communal spaces, such as at the morning meetings, lunch hall, and during various social activities on the evenings and week-ends. I noted all this information as field notes every day. As for the other guests who shortly visited Sólheimar, I studied them through covert observations and informal conversations in communal areas.

I also got access to reports and was given information about blogs written by previous volunteers where they had reflected on their experience. The eight reports in question came from volunteers who came to Sólheimar through the European Volunteer Service (EVS). The EVS requires its participants to write reports of their experience to discuss different learning objectives. The coordinators of the volunteers at Sólheimar had copies of the reports written by their EVS volunteers, and they shared them with me for my project, but also for the report I promised them. I revisited my own report
I wrote after my initial visit in 2010 as an intern. I had to write a report on my learning experiences and activities at Sólheimar to get internship credits for my master’s degree. This exercise turned out to be useful when I selected Sólheimar as a case study as I could reflect on the conclusions I had drawn from my experience as an intern as I designed my doctoral research project.

At the time of fieldwork in 2015, there were also ten students from an American study program called CELL, after The Centre for Ecological Living and Learning, whom I encountered informally through the same activities as the volunteers. I observed them by following them on one fieldtrip to Reykjavik and attending three of their regular lectures. These students and their coordinators were informed of my researcher status. I formally interviewed their two coordinators to get their impressions on the management of their study program at Sólheimar. This interview was mostly done to find recommendations for the report I promised the coordinators at the educational center. This program is based on community participation and self-transformation, and represented nonetheless an interesting case in pedagogic curriculum development and volunteer management. It was valuable in terms of understanding the meaning of transformative learning (which I use as a theoretical concept in Paper III), and for collecting data about student project at Sólheimar (which I present in my findings in Paper IV). The interview took about an hour and was done at the educational center. This interview was recorded, but eventually not transcribed as the many notes taken during and after it, coupled with the notes taken from the ongoing interactions with the CELL group, were sufficient for my analysis process.

Before embarking on my fieldwork, I prepared themes to guide my conversations and observations at Sólheimar (see appendix 8.2). I centered my interactions with volunteers, interns and students on why they came to Sólheimar, their background and what they liked and disliked about their tasks and the place. It was important to investigate their overall impressions of their experience at the village, and the lessons they were learning from their stay. As for the community members, the questions of inquiry centered on how they experience their interactions with the long-term guests that integrate and work in the community. Mainly, discussions and interviews with these individuals centered on how it was to host and work with volunteers, students and interns; what is good about them, whom do they prefer hosting, if they had examples of projects involving these guests, and what challenges they felt their community faced. I gave all the participants pseudonyms, though I must admit I did this automatically without informing them about this during my interactions with them. Key individuals were
informed of my interest in studying volunteer tourism at Sólheimar, and it never was an issue that I would use the village in my doctoral work. I therefore did not keep the whole village anonymous in my work.

I resorted to five interviews with key staff members to avoid researcher bias as much as possible that could stem from spending more time with the volunteers. My affinity and close social interactions with the volunteers meant I had to be creative to approach the managerial and coordinating staff, and other community members throughout my fieldwork. I suspect that I was positioned as a volunteer in the eyes of the community members, and, significantly, in those of the coordinators of the educational center. They sometimes asked me to help out with activities unrelated to my observations, such as tour guiding and cleaning. I felt obligated to fulfill these tasks out of respect for my host. I was nonetheless able to regularly approach the community members during the day at their workplaces and in communal spaces, to observe their activities and practices, and talk with them. I had wished to interview more local people in a formal manner, but quickly realized that these participants questioned the need for a formal setting to discuss mundane topics with someone they considered a volunteer or guest, preferring to chat informally. Caton (2013) argues that methodological choices, often stem from the researcher’s own sensitivity towards the research participants. I therefore realized that informal onsite conversations would be the best means of collecting data, and that I would have to find ways to maximize my social contact to these individuals throughout working days, at events, and through social relations of trust.

I did the formal interviews in English as I do not speak Icelandic. Most Icelanders are highly proficient in the language, and so it did not pose any major issue. I interviewed the two coordinators of the educational center who deal with the volunteers by managing the selection process, welcoming them, and seeing to their integration. It is also part of the coordinators’ responsibility to manage the center, the local guesthouses and offer guided tours of the village, involving them further in the management of visitors. My office space at the educational center placed me in close contact to these coordinators’ daily managerial tasks, enabling me also to conduct many on-site informal conversational interviews with them during fieldwork. It was important to interview the managers of the organic greenhouse and tree nursery as these businesses get the biggest share of volunteers, students and guests. I also interviewed the manager of the wood workshop to get more depth in the perspective of community members involved with creative workshops (though most creative workshops accept very few or no volunteers at all).
I did not record the interviews as they often took place in common areas (e.g., the coffee house and lunch hall) and workplaces (e.g., the greenhouse and the educational center) where there was noise and disturbances from the surroundings. I realized that intensive note-taking and regular member-checking during fieldwork would be better ways to gather valid data. This realization was especially the case after my interview with the manager of the greenhouse in his office. I recorded the interview, but it felt, on the one hand, like it created an uncomfortable situation for the participant, and, on the other hand, that there were too many things happening around to capture quality sound. Not having any transcripts of the interviews prevents the usage and analysis of extensive quotes. I nonetheless ultimately decided that I wanted to place the interview participants in their realm of involvement, and prevent the development of an overwhelming uneven relation between me and my respondents. I thus did not carry on with recording interviews.

The other members of the Sólheimar community included in this study were approached through repeated casual on-site conversations and contextual observations. I notified the participants of my role as a researcher during these conversations which occurred in English. These individuals were: the disabled residents, the music teacher, the social coordinator, nursing staff, the manager of the local store, and managers and employees at the other businesses and creative workshops. Some of my observations of the community members at their workplaces were done while helping as a volunteer, as I described earlier. More specifically, all the creative workshops were observed through three informal visits lasting on average twenty minutes. The greenhouse and the tree nursery were also observed three times, each through informal visitation of about twenty minutes. Observations of the community members were also done regularly in communal spaces.

During my time at Sólheimar as a researcher, I could return to people of interest and inquire further on points that had caught my attention. My close contact with the social group therefore eased the validation process of my research as continual member-checking could be carried out casually throughout fieldwork with different actors as I interpreted my data. I could find these people in common spaces or at their workplace and start a conversation again, when appropriate. By constantly observing people, I could assess the validity of the statements I heard during my discussions. After the six week of fieldwork, I reached a point of saturation as patterns of behavior were emerging in my data.
I nonetheless used my dissemination of my report on volunteers at Sólheimar to further confirm the validity of my conclusions by seeking member-checking after fieldwork. I contacted two staff members who had been long-term international volunteers previously, and one of the coordinators of the educational center. These two former volunteers showed interest in my research project and gave me information mostly in terms of their volunteer experience during my fieldwork. I therefore saw them as people with whom I shared confidence, and with whom I could discuss my interpretations of the community and its volunteers. I sent them, and the coordinator, by email the report, and included some thoughts about my general conclusions of my projects in the same email. While these two participants responded with their feedback as I shared my conclusions and report, the coordinator wrote me back mostly as a thank you for sharing my work than to give feedback on my conclusions. I believe this reflects again that I was perceived as a volunteer, rather than a researcher, by the coordinators at Sólheimar.

Figure 6: Volunteers and residents working at the ceramic workshop (Photo by Solène Prince 2010)  
Figure 7: The organic greenhouse at Sólheimar (Photo by Solène Prince, 2010)
3.4 Methodological Considerations

As I adhere to the spirit of post-structuralism by choosing to work with relational geography, I must address some particular methodological concerns at this point. I say this because the post-structuralist celebration of ambiguity and multiplicity does not sit well with all scholars; some of them have labelled it too relativist (Cresswell, 2013). Relativism leaves very little ground for certainty and this can be very frustrating for those looking for it, especially when making a political or social critique. If we are left with many explanations, which one is the right one? How do we find legitimacy in the claims we wish to make through post-structuralism? Feminists, for instance, would love to claim to hold the truth about gender oppression. However, as Pratt (2008) deplores, if knowledge is always socially constructed (which feminists do see as an accurate affirmation) how can this group validate its interpretation of society in the light of its marginal position? Validity in post-structuralism becomes a complex process. Inevitably, for some critics, post-structuralism’s inability to proffer a political or epistemological stance gives it little value for the advancement of progressive programs (Harrison, 2015).

The real has undeniably become contested territory in the scientific world (Lyotard, 1984), but it does not mean that we should stop believing that knowledge can exist. It rather means that we need to ponder on how knowledge comes to existence. It becomes important for the research to examine the situatedness of the claims she constructs through her data collection and analysis. When we stop believing in pure essences, it is what frames our way of seeing that becomes central to our claim to knowing (Derrida, 1978). Lather (1993, p.676) writes that validity, under post-structuralism, concerns: “[…] making decisions about which discursive policy to follow, which ‘regime of truth’ to locate one’s work within, which mask of methodology to assume”. Validity, for the researcher involved in post-structuralism, is hence about reflecting on the ways she went about constructing what she calls knowledge (Bennett, 1990; Lather, 1993; Pillow, 2003; Woolgar, 1988). It implies problematizing validity as something that requires theorization from the researcher (Lather, 1993; Pillow, 2003). This deprives research of its positivist innocence and perfection, acknowledging that we are dealing with multiple contexts, experiences, agendas, and values as we create knowledge.

The subjectivity of qualitative investigation is significantly evident in ethnography. Frohlick and Harrison (2008) argue that ethnographic research presents only partial knowledge as the researcher is situated in a context where she needs to deal with social relations. The social intimacy
ethnographic fieldwork requires calls for creative demands from the researcher. There is a constant need to access stories and observations in a balanced and rich way, while physical, practical, and emotional challenges can complicate this ambition (Frohlick & Harrison, 2008). The findings will ultimately reflect the researcher’s ability to form bonds of intimacy with her study participants. These bonds are furthermore analyzed through the lens of a particular theoretical framework. The quote below attests to the partiality and creativity of ethnography:

As such, [ethnography] is a method about representing multi-vocal and parallel discourses in which stability and firm representation are challenged. Multi-perspective epistemology and multiple standpoints contest the privileging of any single ethnographer’s representation. Ethnography is thus an impressionistic but also reflexive method, flexible in techniques, and is an approach rather than a set of specific procedures.

(O’Gorman, MacLaren & Bryce, 2014, p.51)

My own ethnographic research has been speckled by moments of creativity and intimacy, which all contributed to the emergence of the conclusions I will present. As I tried to integrate the Sólheimar community to observe it, I believe that I quickly fell into the role of volunteer in the eyes of those involved in the community. It most probably skewed my results in favour of the volunteers’ perspectives. As I mentioned through my description of the data collection process, I tried to direct my attention towards the Icelandic community members involved with the volunteers to get as much as possible their perspectives into the equation. Nonetheless, I did not develop as close bonds of intimacy with the staff as I did with the volunteers. I thought I had a quite close relation with the coordinators of the educational centre, but it seemed that this relation was still based on a volunteer-manager basis as member-checking did not work well with these individuals. My constant attempt to see and hear everything in a balanced way was challenged by my position in the community, in itself due to my personal characteristics. One cannot help but have more affinity to a certain group, and even with certain individuals, than with others. My findings thus reflect a partial perspective of volunteer tourism at an eco-village.
Interview situations must also be recognized for the way they enable the researcher to construct knowledge. Interviews are ultimately dominated by the questions and presumption of the researcher (Kvale, 2006; 1996). This is something that Kvale (2006; 1996) claims cannot be avoided as there will always be someone asking the questions, thus leading the interview in a certain direction, which suits the person asking rather than the one being asked. The contextual aspect of my interviews and my time running around in the field were meant to counter this situation. The idea was that my observations of various facets of social life would reveal what I would not think to ask in ways I did not think to think. It remains that I was after information related to a particular theme, and steered conversations and observations in the direction I was interested in. This interest gave prominence to certain themes over others that could have been considered to be more relevant by other researchers, or even by the study participants.

Tourism scholars have pondered on the constructed nature of their field of study (see Belhassen & Caton, 2009; Caton, 2013; Hall, 2015; 2010; Jamal & Hollinshead, 2001; Tribe, 2006; Tribe et al., 2012). Tribe (2006) listed a number of factors he considered central to the construction of tourism knowledge, deploring that these are largely hidden as significant elements driving tourism research forward. He outlines that personal interests of all sorts can direct a researcher towards a particular subject area, research project, institution or department (Tribe, 2006). Not only are the ideologies we pursue to frame tourism significant, but so are the wider, often unspoken, rules that compel researchers to, for instance, publish in good journals, finish a project on time, bring in money to the department, follow the flow to fit in, etc. (Hall, 2015; 2010; Tribe, 2006). These are all factors that have most probably impacted my own research, and this in ways that I do not even understand.

My findings, from both Bornholm and Sólheimar, should not be discarded nonetheless for their partial, constructed, and subjective methodological features. In the end, they do bring new perspectives to the fore of tourism scholarship. The themes and the related language I created to speak of my respondents’ experiences can serve as discursive anchors in a discussion on moral encounters and coping strategies in tourism scholarship in fruitful ways. Also important to consider is that this project had the freedom to take whichever path it liked. It unfolded as it did with no strict practical expectations or restrictions from a supervisor or organization. This freedom created auspicious grounds to work with theories and ideas in creative ways. Nonetheless, following the article-based model implied getting results out quickly to have publications ready for this thesis. I believe the
fragmented nature of the ensemble of my articles reflect the reality of compiling publications to get a doctoral degree. Rather than presenting one long story, I am left piecing together four different stories.
4 Presentation of Papers

In this section, I present the four papers that form my doctoral thesis. Table 2, on the previous page, is a summary of the individual papers, compiling their respective titles, focuses, methodologies and findings.

4.1 Craft-art in the Danish Countryside (Paper I)

In Paper I, I explore some of the dynamics and complexities faced by the members of the Arts and Crafts Association Bornholm, Denmark as they simultaneously negotiate their position as rural tourism stakeholder and professional artists. Rural spaces become hybrid spaces as local individuals and groups negotiate in various ways their position in a global system (Heley & Jones, 2012; McCarthy, 2008; Woods, 2009; 2007). The overarching theme of Paper I follows the affirmation that rural actors, and their daily activities, cannot be perceived as completely controlled by extra-local manifestations. Rural actors such as the craft-artists of Bornholm are adapting to the influences of global socio-economic changes by participating in the service economy as tourist entrepreneurs. In their search for customers and spectators, these craft-artists have created a quality brand through the grassroots formation of their local association, allowing them to benefit economically and professionally from the short, but intensive tourist season, on their island.

I assert that the study of professional artists working with rural tourism contributes a novel dimension to the conceptualization of individual and collective strategies related to lifestyle entrepreneurship, rural identities, and the commercialization of rural symbols and products. Rural tourism is the concept used to define tourism related to the production and consumption of traditionally rural symbols, lifestyles and products embedded within rural spaces (Lane, 2009a; Ray, 1999). Of interest is that as rural actors participate in tourism, they are left to operate a web of relations and expectations often not compatible with their inherent ideal of a rural lifestyle. As Brandth and Haugen (2011), Burton and Wilson (2006) and Sims (2010) indicate, these actors often end up modifying their values, identities and practices over time to accommodate their position in dynamic extra-local chains of production, regulations and events. Rural actors cannot resist all the pressures they face from extra-local phenomena, but they have the ability to adapt their networks, value systems and internal structures to take advantage of these (Bell, Lloyd & Vatovec, 2010; Chaperon & Bramwell, 2013).
Table 2: Summary of individual papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Craft-art in the Danish countryside: Reconciling a lifestyle, livelihood and artistic career through rural tourism (Prince, 2017a).</td>
<td>On what ground is rural tourism negotiated and legitimized by actors navigating the complexities of rural spaces, and their own multiple identities?</td>
<td>19 open-ended interviews with craft-artists on Bornholm during two sets of qualitative fieldwork.</td>
<td>Narrative analysis by condensing data into themes.</td>
<td>Local actors have the agency to form networks and redefine their identities in the wake of rural tourism development. In this way, they form a hybrid space where they fulfill goals related to their lifestyle, livelihood and professional ambitions simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Dwelling in the tourist landscape: Embodiment and everyday life amongst the craft-artists of Bornholm (Prince, 2017b).</td>
<td>How can tourist landscapes be conceptualized to embed local people in their realm of everyday life?</td>
<td>19 open-ended interviews with craft-artists on Bornholm during two sets of qualitative fieldwork.</td>
<td>Narrative analysis by condensing data into themes.</td>
<td>The daily interactions of local actors with their material realm mediate their interactions with tourists, while their encounter with tourists mediate their interactions with their material realm. This makes mundane practices an integral part of the tourist landscape. The tourist landscape is as such a realm of dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Working towards sincere encounters in volunteer tourism: An ethnographic examination of key management issues at a Nordic eco-village (Prince, 2017c).</td>
<td>What lessons can be learned from the Nordic-eco-village in terms of the pedagogical dimension of volunteer tourism?</td>
<td>6 weeks of participant observations at Sólheimar eco-village, including interviews with 5 key stakeholders. Both host and guests were studied.</td>
<td>Focused ethnography with thematic analysis of data.</td>
<td>The complexities faced daily by local communities exacerbate host and guest relations, and should be discussed sincerely between the two parties and other intermediaries to make volunteer tourism beneficial to the host. The host-community has an important role to play in the volunteers’ learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Contextualizing the complexities of managing alternative tourism at the community-level: A case study of a Nordic eco-village (Prince &amp; Ioannides, 2017).</td>
<td>What managerial challenges do communities face in their attempts to reconcile their social mission with that of their overall economic goals through alternative tourism?</td>
<td>6 weeks of participant observations at Sólheimar eco-village, including interviews with 5 key stakeholders. Both guests and hosts were studied.</td>
<td>Focused ethnography with thematic analysis of data.</td>
<td>Alternative tourism management requires a commitment on behalf of coordinators and managers involved in the practice to promote a reflexive and critical exchange during close encounters between host and guest. This commitment should include the contextualization of the complexities faced by the local stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I explore the agency, networks and negotiations of Bornholm’s craft-artists during the tourist season through three analytical categories in Paper I: *Craft-art and rural livelihoods, Commercializing spaces of artistic integrity* and *Negotiating modes of production and professional identity*. Firstly, these craft-artists find themselves juggling a livelihood with a desired lifestyle as they are drawn to the countryside for personal preferences. Lifestyle entrepreneurs have been observed to enact traditional business-like practices though they put much emphasis on the unconventional aspects of their enterprise (Andersson Cederholm, 2014; Andersson Cederholm & Hultman, 2010). All craft-artists use the tourist season to sell their creations to tourists in order to profit from their rural location. Their professional success is linked to their ability to sell crafts that interest the public, even if producing for a tourist market may seem counterintuitive to their lifestyle and career aspirations.

Secondly, the association plays a significant role in preserving elements of rural authenticity and artistic integrity in the work of the craft-artists. The high standards of entry, requiring a professional background and permanent location on the island, have enabled the craft-artists to strive professionally in the face of commercialization. The craft-artists believe that tourists interested in their crafts are searching for rural authenticity where close contact to the producer and the handmade nature of the crafts fulfill this desire. Through their association, they create a brand that not only ensures, but also celebrates these reciprocal interests. As Ateljevic and Doorne (2003) and Su and Teo (2008) explain, tourism is not necessarily actively resisted as it threatens to commodify local attributes, rather it can be attuned by local stakeholders to preserve cultural originality. In Paper I, I demonstrate that through the creation of their association, the craft-artists increase their agency to negotiate relations of trust with tourists in the face of the commercialization of their work and workshops by upholding a professional and local brand.

From the craft-artists’ commercialization of their creative spaces, there ensue new discourses and materialities aimed at reconciling new modes of production with a professional and ideally rural identity. In the third analytical category, I define how the craft-artists that have chosen to turn their art into a viable business are more likely to define their professional success in terms of sales. These craft-artists send their designs down chains of productions or have employees recreate them, which does not affect their notion of artistic success. Similarly to what Sims (2010) and others have established, it is the definitions suiting the livelihood, lifestyle and professional ambitions of the craft-artist that will be adopted, and which will materialize in their practices and interactions with tourists as rurality.
I use Paper I to contend that the challenge for the tourism researcher is to understand how local actors form rural space by constructing and diffusing a variety of definitions of it that suit their realities and ambitions. I concede that local strategies such as the ones used by the craft-artist during the tourist season confound any clear distinction between lifestyle aspirations, career ambitions and livelihood necessities. In turn, there is no clear distinction between the commercial, professional and rural nature of the space they present to tourists. The type of agency described in Paper I makes local stakeholders meaningful actors in the construction of hybrid and dynamic rural tourist spaces.

4.2 Dwelling in the Tourist Landscape (Paper II)

Paper II is an extension of Paper I where I demonstrate that actions and strategies linked to tourism development also produce a landscape of everyday life. Non-representational theories are valuable to social scientists interested in the study of the social, spatial and material production of everyday life (Thrift, 2004; 2000). Tourism occurs through the performance of mundane actions, where bodies corporeally engage with their surroundings using various objects (Crouch, 2003; 2000; Haldrup & Larsen, 2006). However, in Paper II, I assert that tourism scholars do little to examine tourism as a part of the everyday life of those who dwell within toured landscapes when they apply non-representational theories to tourism scholarship. Often, it is the tourist’s experience of being at a destination that is researched. When locals are involved in non-representational research, it tends to be to study their performative interrelation with tourists, such as at a particular event.

In Paper II, I present the tourist landscape as a mundane space formed through the embodied practices of those who dwell therein as they make sense of the materials, people and spaces around them. I use Ingold’s (2011) dwelling perspective as a theoretical point of departure. Ingold (2011) saw landscape as emerging from the social activities and practical engagement of those who dwell therein. In Paper II, I assess and compare the relation glass-artists and ceramists on Bornholm have with their materials, techniques, and creative spaces during their island’s tourist season. Through my analytical categories, I demonstrate that the everyday practices and embodied movements of these craft-artists fashion the emergence of a realm of dwelling, rather than an exotic domain. I formed three categories to develop this conceptualization: Materials, Techniques and Creative spaces.
In *Materials*, I present clay and glass as having agentic properties which weave themselves in the everydayness of interacting with tourists. Clay is wet and sticky, and thus comes in the way of interacting with tourists when customer transactions need to be made. Ceramists are thus more prone to separate the creation process from sales. Glass is quicker to handle due to its material properties. It is however not suited for letting tourists touch or come too close due to the high temperatures needed to fashion it. While the creation process of the glass designer does not force her to separate creation and sales, it does put a limit to how much she can involve tourists in her world. Materials have as such their own ways at guiding tourist interactions. In *Techniques*, I discuss how local skills become performances attracting tourists, reflecting the fusion of tourism dynamics in the taskscape. This discussion takes further the agentic properties of materials, describing how they lead to certain types of performances. While glass blowing is exciting and attractive to crowds of tourists, handling clay is a long and dull process that is not conducive to the entertainment of an audience. In *Creative Spaces*, I argue that craft-artists ultimately incorporate their social and material relations in the physical landscape. The craft-artists embody their art to the point of recreating particular spaces that reflect their relation to the tourist season. The glass-artists build showrooms, while the ceramists are more reserved in the way they build their interactive spaces.

In line with the dwelling perspective, I conclude in Paper II that the tourist landscape is the product of the skills and techniques these craft-artists have developed over time to work with their different materials, and of the creative spaces which they have built. The materials, techniques and creative spaces used by these craft-artists mediate their interactions with tourists, but also, these encounters mediate the craft-artists’ interactions with these entities. The landscape of mundane embodied practices cannot be detached from the landscape the tourists encounter. It becomes crucial to consider the various elements that make up the everyday lives of those involved in the emergence of a tourist landscape. Excessively reducing local involvement to behavioral models and scientific theories risks dissociating science from the world of the living by disembarking subjects from their realities (Ingold, 2011; Thrift, 2008; 2000). I wrap up Paper II writing: “*With the dwelling perspective, the emphasize is put on the observation and sensation of activities and practices, which can reveal how individuals shape their environment by resisting creatively, coping with, taking advantage and following the dynamics of tourism through everyday practices*” (Prince, 2017b, p.18). Scholars can use the dwelling perspective in their analysis of tourism to embed local people in their cultural landscape.
4.3 Working towards Sincere Encounters (Paper III)

In Paper III, I investigate a popular form of alternative tourism: volunteer tourism. Scholars no longer see volunteer tourism as a tool to international development, but rather perceive it as a chance to offer learning experiences to guests aimed at deconstructing prevailing ideologies between cultural groups (Mostafanezhad, 2014). In this regard, transformative learning became a popular academic benchmark on which to assess volunteer tourism (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011). It is under this light that I explore the host-guest dynamics at Sólheimar eco-village, Iceland, in order to contribute to the conceptualization of transformative learning in volunteer tourism. At this eco-village, the host and volunteers come together to share similar goals and meaningful experiences related to social integration and environmental best-practices. This interaction based in idealist goals gets complicated as the eco-village must inevitably operate under market norms.

In Paper III, I explore how research in volunteer tourism has come to include volunteering on organic farms. Many tourism scholars, such as Kosnik (2014), Miller and Mair (2015; 2014), Mostafanezhad (2016), Terry (2014), and Yamamoto and Engelsted (2014), have broadened conceptions of volunteer tourism by assessing and celebrating the host and guest’s mutual dedication to diffuse environmental best-practice. I recognize that these conclusions contribute to the conception of volunteer tourism as an alternative activity with the potential to communicate skills in organic farming and promote a lifestyle that defies the afflictions of capitalism. However, these studies do not advocate the conceptualization of the pedagogical dimension of such alternative holidays beyond intimacy. Alternative lifestyles are in other words not presented as projects impacted by global structures and discourses in this kind of volunteer tourism research. I make this argument and propose a new pedagogical dimension to volunteer tourism through three analytical categories: Staging sustainability, Reflecting on self and participation and Searching for sustainability.

The eco-community invokes appealing images of sustainability to volunteering guests. However, as explained in the first analytical category, there is displeasure amongst the volunteering guests as they recognize the market-oriented nature of the village and its use of volunteers to provide it with cheap labour. The identification of this difficulty led me to the conception of the second analytical category where the idealist and educational expectations of the volunteers often clash with the practical short-term goals of the community. The task of reflecting on self and one’s
Participation is also necessary at the idealist community as sustainability and alternative lifestyles can mean different things to different actors. I did not observe that these diverging opinions were discussed amongst volunteers and coordinators at Sólheimar. Their encounters seemed more based in managing the comfort and experience of the volunteers than the latter’s transformative experience.

I observed nevertheless the emergence of critical thinking on sustainability during the volunteers’ close encounters with community members. The notion of sincere encounters, which Taylor (2001) presented in his discussion of cultural tourism, is useful to re-imagine the learning process during the host-guest encounter. Taylor (2001) defines sincerity as a shift towards negotiation between host and guest over the meaning of their cultural encounter, instead of the guest looking for, or the host posing as, essential cultural objects. I thus argue that a focus on sincerity reinforces a critical approach to conceive of host-guest encounters, as the focus lies on the agency of the toured host, rather than on the volunteer’s self-actualization. With this approach, both host and guest can participate in constructing new narratives for tourist spaces (Amoamo, 2011; Wearing & Wearing, 2006).

I conclude Paper III saying that: “The transformative experience that binds the host and its guests together cannot solely be presented, by researchers and intermediaries alike, to be about learning to do things alternatively and sustainably through an educational approach focused, on the one hand, on the self-development of volunteers and, on the other hand, their hard labor” (Prince, 2017c, p.14). By advocating sincerity in volunteer tourism encounters, Paper III contends that sending organizations, people in leadership positions, and movements such as Willing Workers on Organic Farms should be more honest with guests over the difficulties alternative hosts face. Focusing on sincere encounters to conceptualize transformative learning in volunteer tourism avoids reducing the host-community into a mere pawn to enrich volunteers, instead of a meaningful agent and benefactor in the practice. Otherwise, volunteer tourism mostly remains what its critiques have accused it to be: an experience to consume for the volunteers (Guttentag, 2009; Palacio, 2010; Sin, 2010).

Furthermore, I argue in Paper III that community members have a responsibility and interest in the transformative experience of their volunteers. The benchmark I propose to assess volunteer tourism is thus related to the ability of community members to communicate, but also modify, their goals and visions through their direct interactions with volunteers in the manner that suits them.
4.4 Contextualizing Alternative Tourism (Paper IV)

I continue my discussion of close encounters in volunteer tourism in Paper IV, where, with Ioannides, I explore the managerial contradictions and difficulties that arise as alternative tourism is developed in the name of sustainability. Here again, I am interested in outlining new ways of thinking to reconcile conflicting interests that emerge between host and guest involved in alternative tourism. Alternative tourism is often considered a form of sustainable tourism, where its smaller-scale and more sensitive operations can be used effectively to generate local bottom-up development (Weaver 2006). However, as we outline in Paper IV, a primary challenge associated with alternative tourism as a path to sustainable tourism is that sustainability is a multi-dimensional concept, meaning its operationalization can mean different things to different players (Butler, 1999). The complexity of reconciling the multi-dimensional character of sustainable development also implies that there is always the real risk that economic growth may divert local actors’ interests away from their original objectives (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lane, 2009b; Weaver, 2013).

It is inevitable that any enterprise, even those aimed at fostering alternative tourism, through their sheer need to survive, might appear profit-oriented, while in reality they are working strategically to stay afloat. Paper IV is grounded in the notion that bridging alternative tourism with sustainable tourism development requires a consideration of the managerial compromises actors make within their distinct contexts while seeking to fulfill particular goals. It is important for the researcher to acknowledge the internal social processes of communities in order to move beyond solutions focused in economic growth, and promote environmental and social equity goals (Matarrita-Cascante, 2010; Matarrita-Cascante, Brennan & Luloff, 2010). Acknowledging the importance of social processes implies looking at how communities handle tourism and its impacts (Salazar, 2010).

In paper IV, we establish that those behind the management of volunteering guests regularly struggle to coordinate these respective groups in a manner that balances economic objectives with environment and social equity goals. The difficulties stem largely from the reality that idealist spaces also have concerns over their economic sustainability as they are forced to function within the capitalist system (Deville et al., 2016; Mostafanezhad, 2016). Through its commercial endeavors, Sólheimar diffuses a brand to its visitors based on the organic and socially responsible in a way that generates much needed revenue. This is not an alternate plan for fostering the
subsistence of a community outside of the current economic system. These challenges are presented in Paper IV as significant practicalities to be addressed to promote alternative tourism, in this case volunteer tourism, as a strategy to generate sustainable tourism at the community-level.

The results of Paper IV are divided in two analytical categories: Reconciling comfort with contribution and Managing productive and creative volunteers. Firstly, the management of the village is not always compatible with the desires of those who wish to learn from it. This is the case when the village seeks to use its volunteers for labor at designated businesses for profit-oriented purposes, while the latter would wish to work on tasks deemed more enjoyable. Many members of the community feel misunderstood as they believe the volunteers do not understand the relevance of their practical needs. In Paper IV, we outline that, without critical reflection between host and guest, alternative tourism is highly comparable to any other standardized form of tourism with an economic concern over the comfort and experience of its guests. This demonstrates that the learning component of alternative tourism does not happen automatically simply because host and guest are in close contact with each other. Furthermore, the management of alternative tourism requires more than the provision of instructions to guests in order to foster desirable long-term impacts on the community.

Secondly, managing volunteers is complicated by the fact that most volunteers are not professionals, and need guidance to execute their tasks. Using the help of volunteers is often seen as a solution to counter structural and economic disadvantages faced by communities (Mostafanezhad, 2014). However, as we observe, these guests need to be coordinated and monitored to ensure desired outcomes. The coordinators of the educational centre at Sólheimar find themselves managing volunteers and their projects, rather than overseeing the improvement of local sustainability by dealing with professionals. We interpret local managers as trying to foster economic growth without investing in resources to develop the volunteers as creative assets. It thus was argued in Paper IV that limited human resources and strategic knowledge exist at the community to fulfill all the host-community’s goals through alternative tourism.

We conclude Paper IV stating that fostering alternative tourism requires looking beyond simplistic notions of keeping operations small, interactive and locally sensitive. In this regard, we propose conceptualizing alternative tourism: “[…] as a forum for discussion between host and guest over the complexities of generating sustainable development” (Prince & Ioannides, 2017, p.354). This redefinition implies: “[…] investment in knowledge transmission over
practical matters such as conflict resolution during the tourist experience, and critical reflection and cultural communication between host and guest over local matters that go beyond simple instructions” (Prince & Ioannides, 2017, p.354). The pursuit of alternative tourism for a sustainable development requires a discussion over the challenges of being ethical in the modern capitalist context. We reinforce that tourism scholars interested in community development should acknowledge the complexities of the local contexts within which managerial decisions are made.
5 Discussion

The aim of this thesis is to imagine novel ways for researchers to conceptually embed people closely involved with tourists within their living spaces by approaching tourism as a phenomenon that creates new and complex relations, imbued with various spatial, but also personal, social, communal and professional implications. In this discussion, I firstly identify the processes behind the construction of places and identities, which outline the plurality of coping strategies, embodiments and negotiations that make up the tourist spaces I have studied. This identification is used to suggest that tourist spaces should be conceptualized as living spaces. The metaphor of the living space is a moral matter and stems from a relational approach to tourism. It moreover addresses my two main research questions: In what ways do local people deal with the presence of tourism in their living space in regards to their particular spatial, personal, and professional identities? How are encounters between host and guest experienced by the host as the latter makes sense of particular communal goals and alternative tourism strategies simultaneously?

I subsequently present two new discursive anchors to speak of tourist spaces as living spaces. I call these: dwelling in the tourist landscape, and sincere encounters. Dwelling in the tourist landscape is explored by addressing the sub-questions: How are places formed through the actions and strategies of local groups as their living spaces simultaneously become tourist spaces? Why would these local responses legitimize the presence of tourists and tourist infrastructure within a living space? Sincere encounters is presented by asking: how can encounters be managed in the light of different ambitions. Lastly, I discuss some of the challenges related to fostering different types of alternatives in tourism by exploring the methodological and moral implications of the findings of my doctoral project for research and practice.

5.1 Imagining Tourist Spaces as Living Spaces

I chose to use relational geography to theorize about the formation of tourist space as produced through diverse social and material encounters. The post-structural elements of relational geography imply an awareness of the networked features of human experience as lives are lived through complex human, and non-human, interactions (Cresswell, 2013; Murdoch, 2006). Such analysis provides a conception of tourism anchored in the plurality and connectivity of human experience celebrated by the proponents of the moral
This consideration is crucial since space is a site of negotiations where identities and experiences are constructed in relation with a multitude of other spaces, people and entities at every geographical scale (Massey, 2005; 2004). Paper I reflects the effect tourism has in reshaping local identities in various ways. Reconciling a desire to live in the countryside with the aspiration to become a professional artist is unavoidably tied to the dynamics of rural tourism. Notions of rural authenticity, artistic norms and agency are simultaneously used to recreate a cultural landscape that fulfils different ambitions within a highly connected world. Relational geography encourages us to think in terms of agency where local stakeholders respond differently to globalization through their negotiations (Massey, 2005; Woods, 2007). Such negotiations were discussed in Paper I. The grassroots formation of the Arts and Craft Association enables these craft-artists to retain and diffuse the brand of professionalism that suits their artistic aspirations to benefit from their island’s intensive tourist season. On an individual level, these craft-artists have the ability to redefine their conception of success, authenticity and rurality to adapt to the changing dynamics of their space and profession through rural tourism. Calling people and places victims of the changing nature of social life is not a productive spatial analysis (Amin, 2002; 1997; Gibson-Graham, 2002). Individuals are constantly making decisions which impact their multifarious positions as residents, community members and professionals within a networked space, and not solely as tourism stakeholders. The actions of stakeholders who get involved in tourism while driven by multiple ambitions form a space highly tied to everyday life.

A serious commitment to understanding the dynamics of local agency implies an interest in the multiple social and material relations that emerge in everyday life (Thrift, 2000; 1996). It is important to remember that tourism forms a realm of embodied performances (Coleman & Crang, 2002). These amalgams of interrelations blur the line between what comprises a tourist space and a living space, making the two an inseparable realm. As demonstrated in Paper II, material relations give clues about the ways the living space is interrelated to the tourist space in mundane physical, social and practical ways. The interactions of local actors are impacted and impact the formation of a landscape to be experienced by tourists. Ingold’s (2011) conception of dwelling proved useful for tying the ordinary and material to the construction of a tourist landscape. For Bornholm’s craft-artists, the precise material used to build a professional identity becomes the medium through which a creative space is experienced as a tourist space. In turn,
tourism becomes a part of the ordinary for the host as the former influences the practices they use to make their crafts and build their creative space.

Important to consider are the features and impacts of the encounters hosts have with their guests, especially in cases where the guest penetrates more intimately the host’s realm of everyday life. The case of Sólheimar presented in Papers III and IV outlines this specific complexity where stakeholder ambitions and local context must be reconciled during host and guest encounters. Since tourism is used as a strategy for the sustainable development of the Icelandic eco-village, this goal must be reconciled with the volunteer’s search for a learning experience. This search is often filled with expectations of encountering an idealist living space, to which the village has difficulties to live up to. The encounters between host and guest in spaces of alternative tourism are ultimately mediated by the host’s everyday task of navigating sustainable solutions in a capitalist world. Compromises over money and mission are intrinsic to the sustainable development tourism actors such as organic farms seek for their enterprises (Mostafanezhad, 2016), and to the success of non-profit organizations (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). As discussed in Paper IV, such compromises influence the dynamics of the relations between hosts, coordinators, managers and tourists, which should encourage the researcher to contextualize tourist encounters in local and extra-local settings to understand the former’s trajectory towards sustainable development.

These answers to my research questions reflect the relational nature of tourism, meaning the latter cannot be delimited nor detached from the multiple phenomena taking place simultaneously around and within its organization (Darbellay & Stock, 2012). Tourism is a fragmented industry where various stakeholders can be making sense of their situation with different ambitions in mind. As shown in this dissertation, these ambitions are obvious in the study of forms of tourism that present some degree of alternative to the standardized holiday, and can be related to local desires of living a rural lifestyle, becoming a professional artist or building a sustainable community. Tourism is a lived phenomenon for these local actors through the negotiations, performances and various relations they embody and entertain with the spaces, people and non-humans around them.

It should become evident that my interest in relational geography lies in the performative and social processes of spatial production that bring entities into being, forming simultaneously hybrid and embodied living spaces. I consider relational geography of great relevance to the study of tourism geography as the latter encourages the study of particular and
complex relations between host and guests. I propose imagining tourist spaces as living spaces. This allows the researcher to capture the everydayness and complexity of tourism in the study of the lived experiences of local stakeholders closely involved with tourists. Tourism is mundane because it has become paradigmatic to the re-ordering of socio-economic life (Franklin, 2004). Its complexity plays out nonetheless in the way it reinvents spaces, identities and social interactions in different manners due to its fragmented and intimate nature (Milne & Ateljevic, 2001).

A moral approach to tourism will be one that sees these social processes and individual positions as meaningful to the study of tourism. To Caton’s (2012) moral concern over what tourism ought to be doing, there can be added the concern over how tourism becomes a mundane, yet complex, experience for those living in tourist spaces. In practice, this means making local experiences matter in the planning and development of tourism as stakeholders deliberate what tourism ought to be doing. As a moral conception of tourism ought to make the practice do more than bring economic growth, it is important to understand the meaning of tourism’s emergence beyond numbers, dollars, plans and schemes of all sorts for the sake of those who are directly involved and concerned by its development. As for when it comes to research, I now wish to present two discursive anchors to encourage researchers to speak of tourist spaces as living spaces.

5.2 New Discursive Anchors

Belhassen and Caton (2009) call discursive anchors conceptualizations without true definitions that are meant to foster scholarly discussions. A commitment to imagining tourist spaces as living spaces is foremost a commitment to form concepts anchored in moral principles to guide scholarly discussions. It is important to think about the language we use as scholars, and how we apply it to make sense of the local strategies we observe and comment on during our research. I wish to argue that the new ontological possibilities brought about by thinking relationally are relevant to a spatial analysis of tourism with a moral foundation. In this sub-section, I explore two new such ontological possibilities by presenting two concepts stemming from an analysis of my results, embedded in relational geography: Dwelling in the tourist landscape and sincere encounters. These two discursive anchors are introduced as an acknowledgment that local experiences, embodied practices, and communal and personal ambitions matter in scholarly discussions interested in the social formation and ethical management of tourist spaces.
5.2.1 Dwelling in the Tourist Landscape

Local responses and conditions are important to consider in the study of tourism as it is factors such as the political atmosphere, administrative structures and environmental amenities, that by large legitimize the type of tourism that flourishes at a destination (Ateljevic, 2000; Hultman & Hall, 2012). It is equally important to consider that, in turn, the new conditions that tourism creates become part of the material, practical and social everydayness of local stakeholders. This is why I propose adapting Ingold’s (2011) dwelling perspective on landscape to the study of the formation of tourist spaces. The dwelling perspective is an acknowledgment that people influence the production of a landscape through their practices and creative movements, but also that the spatial features of this landscape influences the practices and creative movements of those who inhabit it (Ingold, 2011). I argue that this relation is also seen in tourist landscapes where tourism is embodied in the actions of local stakeholders as they fashion a living space through their interconnectedness to various people, processes and environments in the wake of tourism development.

Social performance and embodied practices are central to the formation of tourist spaces (Coleman & Crang, 2002). It is important to add that these movements go beyond the performative encounter with the tourist during a confined intimate, and even sometimes staged, moment. I made this critique in Paper II. The idea of a theatrical stage filled with props, which scholars such as Edensor (2006; 2001) and Larsen (2012; 2010) advance, places local stakeholders and their performative space as only relevant as objects of study when in direct contact with tourists. Performance and embodiment, as I imagine them, relate to everyday life, including the multiple temporal and spatial interrelations the latter implies. With this conception of tourist spaces, the line between the theatrical stage and the living space becomes highly blurred. Dwelling in the tourist landscape can thus replace the theatrical stage and other metaphors based in fleeting staged encounters as a discursive anchor that fosters a moral approach to performativity by acknowledging the dynamic, but also temporal, nature of spatial bonds.

Considering tourist landscapes as realms of dwelling recognizes the presence and influence of local people in spaces consumed and enjoyed by tourists. The craft-artists of Bornholm have formed a tourist landscape through years of professional training, adaptations to economic downturns, strategic networking, costly investments in physical infrastructure, and so on, all of which attest to their particular ambitions and experiences. All these events and decisions weave themselves in the landscapes tourists encounter,
making the latter enduring, yet also dynamic and hybrid. *Dwelling in the tourist landscape* thus denotes that there is a practical and mundane side to the spaces tourists observe, which are highly connected to the social and material realities of local people.

### 5.2.2 Sincere Encounters

Scholars have looked into transformative learning to find new benchmarks to define the success of volunteer tourism, rather assessing it in terms of interpersonal relations than international development (McGehee, 2012; Mostafanezhad, 2014). Such discussions around transformative learning are fruitful to tourism scholarship, but can be expanded to acknowledge the compromises local stakeholders face daily and practically due to their precarious position in a global capitalist system. As I criticize in Paper III, transformative learning focuses on the learning experience of the guest, and by and large overlooks the agency and ambitions of the host in the conceptualization of volunteer tourism. The way cultural groups and communities experience globalization is seen in their hybrid and dynamic features, which authors such as Wearing and Wearing (2006), Taylor, (2001) and Amoamo (2011) argue should be at the forefront of host and guest interactions.

There seemingly lacks compelling discursive anchors aimed at imagining new ways of doing alternative tourism that would consider the complexity of fostering close encounters while attempting to live alternatively and sustainably. I propose the notion of *sincere encounters* to fill this gap. This proposition is inspired by Taylor’s (2001) discussion of sincerity in cultural tourism, where the focus lies on the agency of the host to present her interpretation of her condition. The concept of *sincere encounters* is a moral assertion that honesty and critical reflection should matter during alternative tourism encounters. Working towards *sincere encounters* implies being attentive to the compromises communities and other stakeholders make within their particular context. This term differs from notions of *authenticity* and *intimacy*, which are often implied and problematized in the study of the experiences of tourists, especially of those involved in alternative spaces, such as the organic farm or eco-community. The impossibility to reform a local system beyond capitalist means of production makes the ideal alternative space and experience more of a dream than a possibility (Gibson-Graham, 2003). The idea of *sincere encounters* acknowledges this difficulty, and focuses instead on critically discussing the different ways hybrid modes or production are negotiated between host and guest.
Geographers have conceptualized the non-capitalist ways humans interact, putting emphasis on social interactions to evaluate community success (Gibson-Graham & Cameron, 2007). A focus on sincere encounters encourages reflexive communication between host and guest, making the success of alternative forms of tourism, such as volunteer tourism, a matter of communication, rather than solely economic productivity for the community. In Papers III and IV, I promote the involvement of local stakeholders in critical discussions with volunteers when it comes to the difficulties of reaching a sustainable development. In this way, alternative tourism becomes a forum for critical and reflexive discussion between host and guest. However, effective communication between host and guest cannot be left unchecked, assuming that it will take place effectively on its own simply because the practice is labelled alternative. Managerial plans based in notions of sincerity need to be integrated in tourism development schemes if they are to be successful and beneficial to the community. I thus suggest with Paper IV that sincere encounters should connote a form of managerial commitment to honest exchange on behalf of managers, organizers and community members as they invite guests to explore and contribute to the well-being of a living space.

5.3 Researching Living Spaces

It became apparent early on in my research that reaching my aim would be closely related to my role as a reflexive and attentive researcher. To suggest imagining tourist spaces as living spaces must be complemented with a discussion about the methodological implications for the researcher. Developing discursive anchors in tourism studies implies working with methodologies aimed at capturing subjective particularities (Belhassen & Caton, 2009), which in this case would relate to the experience of living in close relation to tourism. I wish to briefly outline the relevance of using methodologies sensitive to the experience of people navigating ambiguous positions in a complex realm. This engagement undoubtedly implies, as Ateljevic (2000) argues, more involvement with qualitative approaches in tourism studies such as with ethnography and open-ended interviews, in order to empower participants to share their own perspectives.

There is space during qualitative data collection for the researcher to be attentive to confusion, creativity and unexpectedness, which hint at lived experiences (Freeman, 2006). It was this type of attention that led me to write Paper II to decipher the materiality of the tourist landscape the craft-artists of Bornholm fashion. As for Sólheimar, paying attention to the details of everyday life was essential to understand the meaning of contextualization in
management as I presented in Paper IV. Interpretive techniques such as narrative analysis and ethnography can guide the researcher in finding data through multiple sources such as conversations, movements, events, texts and images, all of which testify to the complex composition of everyday life. As MacLure (2013) concedes, the researcher should go towards the moments that she finds interesting during the data collection process. I wish to argue further that these are the moments that will reveal new ways of thinking, such as those I advocated throughout this thesis, about how humans, materials and spaces come together in all sorts of ways.

Researching living spaces in tourism moreover implies a theoretical commitment to understanding the meaning that the fragmented, negotiated, interpersonal and performative nature of tourism has for different stakeholder groups. A theme of this thesis has been to advocate relational geography as a theoretical tool to study tourist spaces. Relational geography opens up the researcher to the complex assemblages that form tourist spaces. In Paper I, I demonstrated that these assemblages are seen in the development of rural tourism where local discourses and practices are coupled with global processes, forming hybrid spaces. In Paper II, I held that non-representational approaches are particularly interesting for giving importance to the objects and moments that show how local lives mediate and are impacted by the formation of space. Furthermore, the close encounters central to alternative tourism can be studied in relation to the local and extra-local processes that create particular managerial contexts. Though not explicitly using relational geography theory in Papers III and IV, I have demonstrated that, in the case of volunteer tourism, the negotiations local stakeholders make daily weave themselves in the interactions they have with tourists. Overall, relational geography represents a fruitful theory to anchor one’s research in contexts of lived experience.

The constructed nature of knowledge entails that there are limitations to the claims the researcher can make about her findings (Lather, 1993). What matters is not to secure exact definitions to explain the world as it is, but to open up to discussions about the different ways to interpret these events in the world (Belhassen & Caton, 2009). Tourism studies has much to gain from a multiplicity of regime of truths operating side by side in a constructive manner. To imagine tourist spaces as living spaces implies looking into a dynamic and complex object of study. Even within relational geography there are different strands of thinking, which have their focus on specific elements. It means that the conclusions researchers elaborate about living spaces in tourism will always be partial, and will need to complement each other. The
stories of the craft-artists and Sólheimar community I have presented mirror my engagement with these individuals as a researcher interested in particular theories, geographical areas and types of tourism. In the case of Sólheimar, my engagement with the community as a young international guest placed me close to the volunteers. This position generated a particular type of findings for Papers III and IV, and required creativity to reach community stakeholders. Researching living spaces with the qualitative methodologies discussed in this thesis implies a close involvement of the researcher with study participants in the field, and as such, an openness to reflect on the constructed and creative nature of research findings.

5.4 Moral Implications and Practical Considerations

In this sub-section, I propose that researching living spaces finds its moral grounds in its openness to the various ways local people dwell and encounter during tourism, and to the diverse ways researchers make sense of these practices. Subjectivity, creativity, and partiality do not automatically discredit the relevance of qualitative inquiry and interpretive techniques. Rather, they reflect the multiplicity of the attributes of social life itself, and thus must be considered in its study. Embracing the inventive nature of research findings is a commitment to taking seriously the diverse ways of being involved in the world, and of those of making sense of it as a social being.

Managerial plans and policy-making are closely linked to the language used by researchers and practitioners as they work to conceptualize tourism development and the benchmarks for its success (Belhassen & Caton, 2009). As Foucault (1980; 1979) defined, social institutions find their power as regimes of truth by creating the language that legitimates their actions. It becomes important to consider the practical repercussions of the way we as researchers define our conception of the world, in effect contributing to the normalization of certain ideas about tourism. Relational conceptions and metaphors such as the ones I imagined through my research, and those of Grimwood (2014) I presented earlier, represent new ways of thinking about tourism that focus on local lived experiences and encounters, rather than tourism itself as the main object of interest. It is by naming the multiple and complex effects of globalization at the performative and contextual level that we avoid continuously promoting the same discourses uncritically (Gibson-Graham, 2004). In a more radical sense, as new voices can be heard through innovative conceptualizations, so can alternative politics be imagined and advocated in their name (Amin, 2002).
Giving primacy to social and material agency in research and practice also has moral implications. Local stakeholders form their space through their interactions with various structures, discourses, materials, and other humans (Massey, 2005; Thrift, 2000). In Paper I, I reveal how rural tourism served many purposes for the craft-artists of Bornholm, which were not only related to economic development, and which complicated each other’s realization. It becomes relevant to acknowledge how these processes occur to make meaningful the actions and practices of local actors in tourism development. An awareness of how humans and non-humans are brought into being in space through their interrelation enables us to enact our responsibilities towards them (Hinchliffe & Whatmore, 2006; Popke, 2009; Whatmore, 2002). In Paper II, I showed that materials can dictate how people make sense of their encounters with tourists through my description of ceramics and glass-making during Bornholm’s tourist season. Tourism strategies are not only guided by managerial guidelines and discourses, but also by the agentic properties of materials. A practical commitment to make local experiences and aspirations matter in tourism planning and development arguably requires being attentive to such social and material properties.

In terms of the moral implications of managing tourist spaces as living spaces, I suggest giving attention, as Mostafanezhad and Hannam (2014) propose, to encounters. As local stakeholders receive guests in their homes, workshops and communities, it is not enough to devise plans to offer an intimate learning experience to the tourist for the practice to be called alternative tourism. As I explain through Paper IV, those involved in the management of receiving guests for close encounters need to strategically prepare for these interactions for tourism to become beneficial for more than economic reasons. I suggest in Paper III that more reflection around the question of what the community wants tourism for is necessary amongst local stakeholders. Communities should also consider how they will handle their interactions with tourists on an interpersonal level, given the reality of their local context. Critical reflection and cultural negotiations can be developed throughout close interactions during guided tours, seminars, private conversations and in promotional material (see, for instance, Amoamo, 2011). There should be some form of moral commitment from the managers, coordinators and other related stakeholders to develop alternative tourism as something that goes beyond the economic benefit of servicing guests looking for an alternative experience. These managerial incentives would need to come with the appropriate development strategies, where success would be envisioned in terms of sincere encounters between host and guest.
My research has involved me briefly in the management of tourists at Sólheimar eco-village as I wrote the report for the coordinators of their interns and volunteers. It was important for me to communicate my results and the relevant theories behind them as there is a moral aspect to making tourism research beneficial to those it uses as its subjects of inquiry (Cole, 2006; Höckert, 2015). Though my involvement as a participatory researcher went only as far as suggestions in a report and discussions with concerned stakeholders, it is still a form of acknowledgment that the researcher can give back to the community or group she studies closely. While it is impossible to say to what extent my report and presence influenced the decision-making of these coordinators, I was informed about a year later that an employee had been hired to manage the volunteers and interns, freeing the managers of the educational center of the task of coordinating these guests. I consider this accomplishment as a step towards taking seriously the management of encounters, in the hope that volunteer tourism can be beneficial for both host and guest in the long-run.

Much can be said about morals and participatory action research, but this is well out of the scope of this research project, which was by far more interested in linguistic proses and conceptual imaginaries. Nonetheless, my involvement at Sólheimar led me to reflect on the difficulty of making concrete changes as a researcher. As mentioned earlier in the research design chapter, it was difficult to get feedback from the coordinators. Their busy schedule led them to prioritize other things than a doctoral student with abstract ideas, who was probably of better use giving a hand to the businesses. The position of the engaged researcher is to be navigated carefully! The moral turn in tourism scholarship needs to continue to encompass discussions and new conceptualizations related to the role of the researcher directly involved in making her research matter in a complex context.

This reflection over the actual impact of my presence at Sólheimar also accentuates the significance of context and human factors such as stress, personal motivation and stamina in participatory research and tourism management. These factors are neither usually considered in alternative nor sustainable tourism theory (see Paper IV, but also Ruhanen, 2008; Smith, 1997). Further ethnographic research would shed light on this reality, hopefully bridging theory with practice more effectively by proposing solutions sensitive to local realities and personal abilities. This consideration outlines the importance of studying close encounters and local contexts in creative and meticulous ways through considerable local engagement in order to do more than simply suggest the application of managerial models.
6 Conclusion and Future Research

The aim of this thesis is to imagine new ways for tourism researchers to conceptually embed people closely involved with tourists within their living spaces. I approach tourism as a phenomenon that creates new and complex relations imbued with spatial, but also personal, social, material, communal and professional implications. These relations are the product of the fragmented and negotiated nature of tourism as a global phenomenon on the one side, but also of the embodied performances required for hosting guests on an intimate level. I establish that close encounters and spatial dynamics are central themes to a moral geography of tourism that considers the plurality and complexity of human experience. A scientific interest in local experiences of tourism is in itself a commitment to imagine more moral ways of doing tourism. Through relational geography, it becomes possible to apprehend these multiple relations that make up local spaces and identities, making them matter in discussions on tourism dynamics and management. Relational geography is a useful frame of departure, leading me to imagine new ways of thinking about tourist spaces in my study of an eco-community and a rural space, where tourism materializes in two quite different alternative ways.

I identify some of the processes behind the construction of places and identities which outline the plurality of coping strategies, embodiments and negotiations that make up local experiences of close encounters in tourism. The tourist spaces I explored are highly interrelated to the everyday practices and goals of its local stakeholders. This interrelation is seen in the case of the craft-artists of Bornholm where their ambitions to live a rural lifestyle and pursue an artistic career are intermixed with their commercialization of their creative spaces and practices during their island’s tourist season (Paper I). The materials and techniques these craft-artists use to create their art moreover mediates their relation to the tourist season by enabling and restricting certain mundane practices, which weave themselves in the tourist landscape (Paper II). The case of Sólheimar eco-village sheds light on management issues in a space with actors negotiating an idealist position within the capitalist system while hosting volunteering guests (Papers III and IV). The complex position of the eco-village’s local actors affects their interactions with their guests as they try to benefit from their presence. All these findings lead me to propose imagining tourist spaces as living spaces.

This thesis enriches the moral turn in tourism scholarship by suggesting new metaphors that can be used to make local experiences and aspirations matter in tourism research. *Dwelling in the tourist landscape* and
sincere encounters from Papers II and III are presented as discursive anchors to hopefully ignite conversation among scholars over the mundane, yet complex, reality of living with tourism. Researching living spaces, rather than tourist spaces, has significant moral, methodological and practical implications. I argue for a commitment from tourism researchers and practitioners alike to make local experiences matter in the conceptualization of tourism development and its success. Methodologically, this requires close involvement with research participants, an openness to work with compelling and unconventional data, and to reflect on the subjectivity and creativity of our research findings. Practically, it means finding the managerial plans and policies that give primacy to local agency and experiences, and which enable local groups to share their perspective of their complex context with their guests.

This thesis contributes to the application of non-representational theory to tourist studies. Ingold’s (2011) dwelling perspective has not quite yet been seen by tourism scholars interested in performance and materials as a significant tool to embed local inhabitants in the tourist landscape. Further research in tourism studies could investigate the non-representational ways in which local people make sense of the toured landscape they inhabit in order to contribute to the formation of new discursive anchors in the moral discussion of tourism development.

This thesis also contributes insight about the way tourism researchers can imagine alternative tourism management as a theoretical concept. I propose thinking of alternative tourism as a forum for discussion where the host and guest can exchange reflections as they attempt to build sincere and critical perspectives of each other. Alternative forms of tourism that bring community members in close contact with guests cannot be deemed alternative solely because they are small in scale and offer some sort of learning experience. The proponents of transformative learning in tourism scholarship have made the practice more pedagogical. There nevertheless needs to be a way to involve the community more meaningfully in the critical and reflexive experience of the guest to make local experiences matter in the development of alternative tourism. While my scientific contribution with this case lies foremost in my critique of a lack of contextual consideration in managerial plans and my subsequent imagination of a discursive anchor and its potential application, further research could investigate practical outcomes and identify more social and human factors challenging the management of sincere encounters.
The cases presented in this thesis were meant to shed light on original and peculiar aspects of tourism development in the northern European context. Investigating craft-artists as stakeholders in rural tourism brings a new dimension to a form of tourism usually associated with food and drink production. This case highlights the challenges and agency of a new entrepreneurial group making sense of tourism in a rural space. The Nordic eco-village as a case to study volunteers came in contrast to the usual focus on the community of the global South. Using an eco-village, moreover in a developed context, outlines critical challenges related to managerial issues during volunteer tourism. With these unlikely cases, and the call to imagine tourist spaces as living spaces, I suggest that further research in tourism studies should be directed at expanding the range of stakeholders, issues, forms of tourism, and places studied, making them meaningful items in the exploration of tourism dynamics and development.

This thesis touches upon morals in different ways, but not upon matters of social justice and human rights, which are of significant importance in discussion of tourism geography. As tourism expands in multiple ways, it puts at risk many cultures and environments in vulnerable parts of the world. Global changes shift power relations in challenging ways which deserve the attention of the tourism researcher interested in local experiences, spatial dynamics and moral imaginaries. As seen lately, refugees run aground the beaches of the Mediterranean Sea, violent weather patterns and rising sea-levels put stress on coastal destinations, Cecil the Lion made global news as a tourist hunted him down, and the list goes on. How do these events destabilize social and spatial identities? What do they imply for those who live in close contact to their occurrence? The role of gender, race, ethnicity and sexual orientation in tourism encounters are worth significant scientific attention as these features become lived experiences that impregnate the cultural landscapes in various ways. To reiterate the claims I made in the introduction, the tasks of managing, imagining and doing tourism are ultimately moral ones. As for the researcher, the task will be about looking for all kinds of clues that can inform scholarship and practice of the diversity of social and human experiences that shape the highly fragmented and performative realm of tourism into a living space.
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8 Appendices

8.1 Interview Questions

1. The artist – How did you come to practice your art on Bornholm?

- When did you start with ceramics/glass-blowing?
- What got you interested in art?
- What type of training, education and background do you have in your art?
- How did you build your studio? Where does your raw material come from?
- What is your source of inspiration? Is Bornholm a part of it?
- How often do you develop new pieces of art? A new collection?

2. The artist on Bornholm – How it is to be a crafts person on Bornholm?

- What are the advantages of practicing art on Bornholm?
- What are the challenges?
- Is your art your only job?
- How does your process of creation work?
- How are you involved in ACAB? How has it helped you develop your art?
- What are the challenges faced by ACAB according to you?
- Do you have the continuity of ACAB at heart?
- Are you part of any other associations or networks? How do these help you develop as an artist and/or business? (The Design School, Grønbechsgård, Glass Context)
3. Dealing with the tourist season – How is it to live with the tourist season?

- How do you benefit from the tourism season? In terms of profit, product development, marketing your art, networking, etc.

- Does ACAB help to take advantage of the tourist season?

- Do you get any type of support to innovate as an enterprise for tourism by other organizations?

- How do you innovate to reach out to the people who come as tourists in the summer?

- Do you have projects to innovate further as an entrepreneurial artist?

- How do you feel about the seasonality of the tourist season?

- What do you do when the tourist season is over?

- What do you wish for the future?
8.2 Participant-observation Guide

**Long-term guests (Volunteers, interns and students)**

- Reason for volunteering or interning at Sólheimar eco-village
- Background (education and work related)
- Like about Sólheimar (General: the village, its atmosphere, its management, etc.)
- Like about their task at Sólheimar (General: the experience, the structure, the support, etc.)
- Dislike about Sólheimar (General: the village, its atmosphere, its management, etc.)
- Dislike about their task at Sólheimar (General: the experience, the structure, the support, etc.)
- Overall impression of experience (the positive and the negative)
- Lessons learned during stay at Sólheimar

**Community members (Managers, coordinators, employees, residents)**

- Experience of interacting with volunteers, students and interns (the positive and the negative)
- Experience of working with volunteers, students and interns (the positive and the negative)
- Experience of hosting volunteers, students and interns (the positive and the negative)
- Preferred kind of volunteers, students and interns (Personality traits, background, etc.)
- Examples of volunteer, student and intern projects at the village
- Challenges for the future of Sólheimar (General and in volunteering)