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The Tourist Culture Nexus: Occurrence, Advantages, Sustainability

Abstract

This article investigates the concept of tourist culture in three island cases. Fieldwork and qualitative depth interviews of key stakeholders are used to identify and describe. Tourist culture is identified through artefacts and practises that are shown to be stimulated, reinterpreted and created as a result of interactions between hosts and guests, both of whom are shown to have distinct cultures of their own. Tourist culture is thus described as a nexus between. A range of benefits are identified. These may be associated with overall sustainability of tourism. Yet findings highlight that tourist culture evolution is affected by stage and scale of tourism development and may therefore need careful management if it is to be established and maintained.
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1.0 Introduction

The occurrence or not of tourist culture, how this can be defined, and what implications can be drawn from in relation to sustainability, are explored in this research article. Tourism is widely associated with cultural influence upon and fusion with local cultures (Smith, 2003). Tourist culture may be observed through the outputs and implications of this influence and fusion. This is something of an evolutionary process, which may be developed through decades of experience hosting tourists (Sindiga, 1996). It is affected by the culture and
actions of visitors themselves (Wilson, 1997), their hosts (Smith, 2003), and influenced by
the unique requirements and processes of hosting tourism (Cooper, 1995; Butcher, 2003).

Development of tourist culture has been associated with many positive impacts, such as resident involvement and adaptability (Butcher, 2003). This adaptability may underpin an ability to co-opt tourism development in a way that is favourable to a community’s needs and desires (Prasad, 1987). Hence positive impacts of tourism tend to be enhanced, and negatives ameliorated, avoided or managed to be more tolerable. With such underlying conditions, more sustainable management of tourism may be more likely. Thus tourist culture may be seen as contributing to sustainability and may henceforth it may be useful as a tool for its assessment.

Measurements evaluating the relative sustainability or otherwise of tourism developments have tended to focus on an economic or an ecological perspective. For instance, there is common use in the literature of ecological carrying capacities and reviews of conservation measures (Buckley, 2002; Twining-Ward and Butler, 2002; Sharpley, 2003). Yet the social and cultural perspective of sustainability tends to be less extensively explored (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Tao and Wall, 2009). Furthermore, tourist culture is itself a seriously overlooked concept within the literature. Where it is described, this is usually from the perspective of tourists and the temporary cultures they may enter into (Jafari, 1987) or create (Sorensen, 2003) whilst on holiday. The role of and interactions with hosts and their cultures is less well observed.

What contributes to and constitutes tourist culture and the potential contribution of tourist culture to sustainability, is something which merits further investigation therefore. Small islands may be an ideal location for investigating cultural dynamics thanks to their distinctive indigenous identity, and in light of heightened sustainability challenges faced. This paper explores tourist culture in the context of three small islands at varied stages of
tourism development. Such a process is of interest to tourism theorists and practitioners in general, and to those involved in implementing and measuring sustainable development particularly.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Tourist Culture Nexus

Tourist culture may best be seen as a nexus between host culture and guest culture (see Figure 1). On the one hand host culture is that which is indigenous to a locale: its particular arts and crafts, language, traditional roles, festivals, and ways of doing things (Tsartas, 1992; Simpson, 1993; Tapper, 2001; Smith, 2003). In the case of small islands, these often host unusually rich and distinctive cultures due to their relative isolation. This must be adapted to creatively and often disjoints from wider socio-economic changes felt in mainland areas (Boissevain, 1979; Wilkinson, 1987; Keane, 1992; Berry, 2009). Island culture is informed by particular geographic size and setting, and wider historical, social, economic, and political context. Hence small islands are far from homogenous (Milne, 1992), and even proximate neighbours in archipelagos tend to be characterised by a strong and unique local identity (Boissevain, 1979). Language richness is noted for instance. Indigenous languages may persist on small islands when extinct elsewhere, whilst unique dialects may have evolved individually in isolation (Peron, 2004; Sallabank, 2006; Royle, 2008).

On the other hand is guest culture. This may be influenced by the originating cultures of guests, who act on holiday in ways influenced by their cultural background (Wilson, 1997; Carr, 2002; Yuksel, 2004), or perhaps in reaction against this (Hughes, 2002). Particular temporary tourist culture exists also for those on holiday. This is typically less restrained and more hedonistic (Carr, 2002; Kim and McKerchner, 2011). Tourists are frequently informed by common bonds of exploration, escapism, and hedonism expressed through certain typical
pursuits and behaviours (Fodness, 1994; Urry, 2002). More than this, interactions between
tourists may create unique if temporary cultures with identifiable social structures, norms and
values, such as that amongst backpackers (Sorensen, 2003).

It is the interplay between these two cultures which could be seen as the creation,
negotiation and overall evolution of a tourist culture informed by both. The melange of host
and guest cultures is typified as an evolutionary process that takes place over time (Smith,
1989; Butcher, 2003). It has been suggested that destinations with long histories of hosting
visitors may develop a tourist culture whereby tourism becomes a part of everyday life
(Sindiga, 1996). Host cultures may evolve alongside and adapt to the presence of guest
cultures, co-opting many aspects into local tradition, practise, and identity. An example of
such a complex dialogue is Maltese handicrafts, with some products and styles originally
intended for external audiences being appropriated into local culture (Markwick, 2001).
Tourists themselves can contribute creatively to cultures; spontaneously establishing
attractions for instance (Lovelock, 2004). Hence tourist culture may represent previous
concepts of culture as social structures of unification and subsumption (Sorensen, 2003).

Tourist destinations tend furthermore, to have a specific economic, social and
environmental make up. This is shaped by input from new economic and social migrants
attracted by tourism, who will inevitably influence the local economic, social, and
environmental landscape (Damer, 2000). Demand for certain infrastructure, facilities,
services, attractions and forms of cultural presentation also influence (Tsartas, 1992; Royle,
amongst local residents for example. Meanwhile, Smith (2003) describes local residents
taking part in cultural events for the creation and recreation of cultural meanings invested
within. And Canavan (2013a) describes presence of foreign visitors fostering micro-domestic
tourism, whereby small island residents undertake touristic activities within island.
Likewise cycles of seasonality linked with tourism may alter local socio-cultural landscapes. For example, migrant labour, adjusted familial routines, and altered traditional calendars may characterise as individuals try to exploit the peak season (Buhalis, 1999; Andriotis, 2005). The presence of tourists moreover, causes a society to adjust routines in order to accommodate them, take on elements of presentation of itself for visitor consumption, and to analyse itself through appreciation of what incomers report back (Simpson, 1993; Tapper, 2001; Smith, 2003; Pennington-Grey et al., 2005). Hence social roles, events and routines all evolve with tourism development over time, as do local facilities, infrastructure, and natural and cultural landscapes (Cooper, 1995; Buhalis, 1999; Hampton and Christensen, 2007).

As a consequence, many tourist destinations have a unique cultural flavour of their own. Tourist destinations have been described as more entrepreneurial (Chaperon and Bramwell, 2013). Similarly they have been characterised as more liberal. The nature of tourist hosting, involving social interactions and cultural exchanges, means destinations may be particularly multicultural, culturally experienced and sophisticated, and by association open-minded and tolerant (Wilson, 1997; Brown, 1998; Hampton, 1998; Tapper, 2001; Shunnaq et al., 2008). To illustrate, minorities and disenfranchised groups are likely to be involved in tourism due to the nature of industry employment, its support for small scale entrepreneurship, and demand for diverse cultural inputs. Vulnerable groups meanwhile, such as homosexuals, may be able to use tourism to promote their identity and culture, thus gaining wider recognition, public acceptance, political support, and human rights protection (Hughes, 2002; Smith, 2003).
2.2 Tourist Culture and Sustainability

Thus the evolution of tourist culture could be regarded as a mutually rewarding process for both host and guest, and symptomatic of more sustainable tourism development. Rothman (1978) proposes that communities with long experience of tourism are able to develop mechanisms to accommodate inconveniences. Similarly, Smith (1989: 16) outlines: “If a group can survive the transition from incipient to full blown mass tourism, then it may ultimately achieve what is termed ‘tourist culture’, or a process of full accommodation so that tourists are part of the ‘regional scenery’”.

In this situation residents are more involved with the industry, more able to appreciate its benefits, feel a sense of ownership over, promoting entrepreneurship, and contributing to positive host-visitor interactions (Sindiga, 1996). Involvement with the tourist industry, known as significant to fostering positive, deeper, and more meaningful host-guest relationships (Go and Govers, 2000; Spencer and Nsiah, 2012), is likewise linked to cultural resilience and adaptability. These have been associated with flexibility, self-sufficiency, innovation, entrepreneurship, and utilising community resources imaginatively. Such attributes may help to control, exploit and shape tourism developments for the better (Briassoulis, 1979; Campling and Rosalie, 2006; Chaperon and Bramwell, 2013). As such, tourism research repeatedly highlights the importance of resident involvement to sustainability of development (Allen et al., 1988; Ioannides, 1995; Theuma, 2004; Andriotis, 2005; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2005; Graci, 2012; Reimer and Walter, 2013).

Ideally this evolution would be a balanced situation, with both host and guest cultures able to inform, exchange, and negotiate in a way acceptable and enhancing to both. The unique cultural and natural landscapes of small islands may make of potential interest to visitors. The tourism industry may be a source of benefits particularly relevant in light of challenges to inhabit, what are typically isolated locations with restricted economic and social
landscapes (see Ayres, 2000; Buckley, 2002; Andriotis, 2005; McElroy, 2006). However, as is widely appreciated from the literature that tourist hosting can be a destructive process. Alongside diverse benefits, many negative impacts can be caused or worsened by tourism development in the fragile and confined spaces of small islands (i.e. Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Briassoulis, 2004; Theuma, 2004). Cultural homogenisation, displacement of indigenous peoples, inflation, increased inter and intra group tensions, breakdown of traditions, invasions of privacy and destruction of mutually evolved cultural and natural landscapes are commonly recorded (Simpson, 1993; Wheeler, 1993; Royle, 2003; Smith, 2003; Briassoulis, 2004; Sanchez and Adams, 2008). Rather than evolution of a mutually enriched culture, such situations symbolise the destruction of cultural diversity, with ultimately unsustainable consequences for hosts and guests.

The process of tourist culture evolution may therefore be seen as a sustainability indicator. Yet it might also be highly uncertain. As suggested by Butcher (2003), taking inspiration from Butler’s (1980) ubiquitous TALC model of destination evolution, stage and scale of tourism development may affect levels of tourist culture (see Figure 2). There may for example be situations where an overly dominant host culture could be unreceptive to change, and thus remain unwelcoming to tourists and perhaps stifling to many residents (i.e. Damer, 2000). Alternately, an overly dominant guest culture could overwhelm and subsume that which is indigenous to a locale, threatening cultural degradation, homogenisation, and displacement (i.e. Tsartas, 1992; Briassoulis, 2004). Lastly, it could be seen that a decline in tourism, might see the loss of tourist culture. This process might serve to disrupt, and potentially ultimately destroy, that which has uniquely evolved (i.e. Hampton and Christensen, 2007).
3.0 Methodology

This article is based upon extensive fieldwork in three small island case studies. Cases were repeat visited between June 2010 and September 2012. In the Isle of Man fieldwork was considerably enriched by periods of semi-residence on the island during, before and after this period. Amongst the limitations of this study is the significant variation in time spent on individual islands. However, whilst it is accepted that this approach will have limitations in terms of its representativeness, for exploratory research in an under-researched topic, such an approach remains valid, and pragmatic advantages were felt to outweigh (as per Casey, 2009).

Cases were selected for pragmatic considerations, such as accessibility and language barriers (the author(s) being able to speak English and French). Also for methodological
considerations, such as significant populations to sample from. And lastly for theoretical considerations, including sizeable permanent populations from which it may be assumed an indigenous culture may emerge. All of the islands also host significant tourism industries. This was important in order to explore the interactions with and impacts of guest culture on host culture. At the same time, different stages of tourism development were sought in order to investigate how this could affect tourist culture. It was broadly assumed that those islands with longer experiences of hosting tourism, would have more established tourist cultures (Sindiga, 1996). Likewise those islands where tourism is larger in scale and hence more pervasive (Butcher, 2003).

Fieldwork involved field trips to tourist attractions, attending events, participant observation of and with island tourists, reviews of government statistical data, local news and media, and local literature. These were used to immerse within local culture and to build a broad understanding of local tourism and the surrounding context. This process fostered an immersion in the case studies important to both data collection, building rapport with interviewees (McGivern, 2006), and data analysis, helping to understand, interpret and contextualise results (Connell, 2005).

Subsequently, depth qualitative interviews were conducted with tourism stakeholders. The aim here was to recruit a wide sample of tourism stakeholders. Purposive sampling was used therefore to access a range of tourism planners, managers, employees, local politicians and special interest groups members (as with Adu-Ampong, 2014). Organisations such as government departments, conservation charities, hotels and attractions, were contacted in order to request interviews with representatives. Additionally, island residents who experience more general contact with tourists through geographic proximity, were targeted (as with Aas et al, 2005). Snowball sampling occurred to an extent due to the nature of building contacts within small island tourism networks. A total of 46 interviews lasting for an
average of 30 minutes were conducted (25 Isle of Man, 11 Lewis & Harris, 10 Belle Ile). These interviews were live recorded and then transcribed within 72 hours by the researcher. Emergent patterns were categorised and analysed using NVIVO software and traditional colour coding/copy and paste techniques.

Due to the exploratory nature of the project, limited past precedent, and study origins, research was an inductive process based upon pragmatic use of principles of social constructivism to explain how data is created (see Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007). A constructivist approach to grounded theory was used to interpret data and build conclusions (see Mills et al, 2006, Thornberg, 2012). The technique, allowing for a back and forth approach to data construction, and emergence of concepts through data analysis, rather than a testing of preconceived hypothesis (as per Glaser, 1992; Thornberg, 2012), was felt to be valuable in this research context.

3.1 The Case Studies

Lewis & Harris is the largest and most northerly island in the Outer Hebrides archipelago located off the coast of northwest Scotland, British Isles. The island, historically though not geographically divided between Lewis to the north and Harris to the south, is characterised by dramatic and largely inaccessible landscapes. Mountains dominate the south, becoming expanses of peat moorland further north. There are numerous sea lochs, lakes, and tarns throughout the island. Expansive sandy beaches dot the often challenging to access coastline. It is not hyperbole to describe the islands as feeling at times like a moonscape. Rare flora and fauna present include golden and sea eagles. Population is concentrated in the port of Stornoway, the economic, commercial and administrative hub. Located throughout the island are small townships usually following a distinctive pattern of ribbon development alongside the islands’ few roads. Economically the Outer Hebrides lag behind other Scottish islands and
regions. The public sector in 2001 accounted for nearly 32% of jobs and GDP per head is 66% of the UK average (http://www.cne-siar.gov.uk). Sign of generous external subsidy is apparent to visitors in terms of the extensive and modern civic facilities. Evidence of economic migration is present in the many empty properties throughout the island. Tourism is a focus for development. Sites are well signposted and presented, with a range of modernised facilities and tourist enterprises, albeit the isolation and limited infrastructure of the island curtail.

Belle Ile is the largest and most populous of the French Atlantic islands, situated off the southern coast of the Breton peninsular. The economy is dominated by tourism, with some 23,000 guest bed spaces, and around 450,000 visitors per annum. Upwards of two thirds of employment is tourism related. The industry, primarily serving domestic French tourists, is very seasonal (insee.fr). Large crowds, busy atmosphere, and variety of tourist enterprises, infrastructure, and services, characterise the island during summer. Arriving ferries queue up to debark and collect passengers. The roads are busy with competing car hire niches: Renault Twizzys, electric buggys, Segways, scooters, and Citroen Meharis. The atmosphere is almost one of a floating theme park. Tourism infrastructure centres on the largest town and port, La Palais. This is the location of the Vauban Citadel, the island’s main attraction besides its mild climate and attractive coastal scenery. Belle Ile has a long history of hosting tourists, with artists such as Claude Monet and Paul Gauguin helping to popularise the island during the late 1800’s. A somewhat exclusive image has been retained. Yachts and villas for the Parisian bourgeoisie are prominent. At the same time, camping, holiday villages, and many ‘ordinary’ day trippers, are prevalent.

The Isle of Man is a self-governing crown dependency, with the locally elected Tynwald parliament (reputed to be the world’s oldest in continuous operation), having power to pass legislation which affects the island. A unique culture shaped by Celtic, Norse, and
English influences, reflects the island’s geographic position located in the centre of the Irish Sea. The island is characterised by a diversity of natural habitats, from high moorland, to wooded glens, coastal heath, cliffs and dunes. From the 1890’s to the 1960’s the Isle of Man was a major British tourism destination thanks to its distinctive cultural identity, rich natural landscape diversity, range of historic sites, and sense of otherness supported by a marine access barrier. Vestiges of this past remain in the impressive promenades of the capital, Douglas, still functioning steam and electric tram railways, and the once tended pleasure gardens now largely run wild. Since then however, visitor numbers have fallen to around one third of past levels, with tourism today creating around 5% of GDP and 14% of jobs (Isle of Man Digest 2010). As elsewhere in Northern Europe, cheaper and more exotic foreign competition has superseded (Walton, 2000). Nevertheless, the annual TT motorbike festival remains a large scale tourist event attracting upwards of 40,000 visitors.
Table 1: Case Studies Key Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Lewis &amp; Harris</th>
<th>Belle Ile</th>
<th>Isle of Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population*</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic size (km²)</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Numbers*</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment at least somewhat dependent on tourism (%)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALC Stage</td>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Late Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Industry*</td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Peron, 2004; insee.fr; Isle of Man Digest, 2010; cne-siar.gov.uk
4.0 Research Findings

This section reviews the findings of research. Briefly speaking, tourist culture was identified in each case. This involved observations and interviewee descriptions that could be seen to exemplify. These could be related back to the existing literature. Tourist culture was found to have a number of impacts. Findings did suggest tourist culture may be influenced by tourism industry scale or development stage. Implications for measuring and managing tourism sustainability emerge, and are related to the relevant sustainable tourism literature.

4.1 Host Culture

Fieldwork demonstrated the three islands maintained strong and distinct local identities. This was despite considerable pressure from economic developments, including tourism, and influence of large proximate neighbours. Opportunities to attend produce shows on the Isle of Man for example, gave insight into the strong farming traditions of the island. Interviewees provided rich descriptions of local ways of doing things, vernacular, superstitions, and points of proud difference with elsewhere. For instance, a refusal amongst Isle of Man inhabitants to say the word ‘rat’ lest it brings bad luck, stemming from old sailing tradition. Persistence of religious observation on Lewis & Harris that would seem rather old-fashioned elsewhere in the UK. Or particular foods unique to Belle Ile.

Such distinctions may be subtle, but they recognisably stemmed from unique local history, geography, and peculiarities of life in isolated small islands. Participants across the islands also discussed the variety of cultural events and entertainment opportunities available.

“There is always something to do. Choir, Ramsey Town Band, always a concert, the Guild, art... I could go out every night” (J. Conservationist, Isle of Man).
Nevertheless, limitations and restrictions of local culture were voiced in each case. The islands were viewed by some or at times, as isolated, homogenous, restrictive or boring places to live. This was particularly the case amongst younger residents concerned about a lack of economic opportunity or social variety. “There is nothing for young people to keep them here” (H. Employee, Lewis & Harris). “Out of date views and too much religion” (Z. Employee, Lewis & Harris). “There is nothing to do” (A, Employee, Belle Ile). Fear of gossip leading to self-censorship, such as of sexuality, was also described. “You can’t do anything. Everyone know(s) your business” (S. Resident, Isle of Man). “It isn’t very easy to be (gay) here... I just don’t want to be talked about, labelled, to be labelled that way... if my boyfriend comes I am careful not to do anything with him in public” (X. Resident, Isle of Man).

4.2 Guest Culture

Hence research found host culture exists in three small islands, for better and for worse. This existence is both alongside and informed by wider surrounding cultures which interact with. One particularly interactive culture is that of guests.

Guest culture could be identified in those facilities, attractions and landscapes especially popular with visitors. These become obviously geared towards their service. Here the usual trappings of a visitor economy are evident and shape the atmosphere of surroundings. Other areas, such as industrial zones, are little touched by tourism. In general the demeanour, activities, outlook, even dress of tourists distinguishes them from local residents. As such they can be easily observed.

Guest culture is orientated towards specific interests, such as surfing, or more generally, leisure. Often these interests are not shared with island residents. Hence cultural differences can be a source of novelty and amusement for residents observing. “They make me laugh” (T. Manager, Lewis & Harris). They may also create minor frustrations at cultural
frictions, such as with tourists slow pace getting in the way. “Bloody tourists blocking up the mountain road. Stick to the coast road if you are sightseeing!” (S. Resident, Isle of Man).

Guests additionally bring their national cultures with them. Although tourism in the three cases is primarily domestic, hence cultural differences between hosts and guests relatively reduced, inhabitants in each case can and do distinguish. As islanders’ identity is viewed as distinct from proximate neighbours, all tourists are ‘foreign’. Albeit, noted in each case was additional enthusiasm for tourists from further afield, seen by participants as bringing a heightened sense of cultural variety and excitement. “It’s really exciting when the Germans come (J. Conservationist, Isle of Man)”

4.3 Tourist Culture

Research suggested evidence of a tourist culture in the three islands studied. This was based upon host cultures and stimulated by the involvement of local inhabitants in tourism and the inputs of guest culture. Two Isle of Man participants involved with Celtic culture for example, appreciated the linkages made through tourism with other musicians and performers. These connections led to ideas and travel exchanges, which in turn stimulated revivals and reinterpretations of tradition.

Resident involvement appeared to suggest an element of social exchange, ideas stimulation, cultural sharing and other outputs between island residents and tourists. It was this which facilitated the evolution of tourist culture. High levels of resident involvement with local tourism were found across the islands. There were diverse interactions with tourists. This included formal employment in tourism and significant entrepreneurial activity associated with the sector, such as supplementary seasonal employment, informal retail, or letting out spare bedrooms. Through this island residents and tourists come into close contact. The social aspect of tourism employment was noted. Talked about were business partnerships
formed with, and ideas stimulated as a result of interacting with, tourists. “Everyone was coming in and asking ‘where can I get an ice-cream’ and there wasn’t. So I thought why not I do it like? That’s where the idea came from in the first place” (E. Manager, Lewis & Harris).

General sharing of atmosphere and public spaces was apparent. Much discussed during interviews was appreciation of the atmosphere brought by tourists, with contrasts frequently drawn between high and low seasons. The former tended to be seen as accompanied by greater excitement, entertainment diversity and social opportunities. “I like the visitors. They give the place a bit of spark. I’m always so sorry when they leave.” (C. Manager, Isle of Man). The latter was often described as quiet and at times lonely or boring. “In the winter it can get very lonely” (B. Resident, Belle Ile). “They (visiting motor-bikers) are such nice people... really quiet, gentle. I’m always sorry the day after they’ve gone” (J. Conservationist, Isle of Man).

More personal exchanges with tourists were also commonly discussed. Participants spoke of forming friendships, business partnerships and even marriages with tourists, emphasising the occurrence of deep social exchanges between residents and visitors. “My wife did it for the social side really... she was one for getting to know people... found them fascinating. They really were interesting people from all over the world” (V. Manager, Isle of Man). Tourism was additionally linked to sexual relationships by young residents in each case. This was as a result of both increased social opportunities and the added anonymity presence of unknown people brought. “There were two of them (tourists) in the pub... Took him home with me (laughs). The next night went back and got his friend!” (R. Resident, Isle of Man). Sexual contact was clearly exciting. It could also be liberating. Two participants talked about the difficulties of expressing homosexuality in a close knit and often socially conservative community.
Inhabitants were additionally found to act as tourists within their own islands. In all cases inhabitants discussed using tourist orientated facilities for their own enjoyment. Widespread description was of touristic trips and activity, such as visiting attractions, going to the beach, picnics in the countryside, camping, romantic breaks and family distractions. Such activity was described as being stimulated and enhanced by the presence of overseas visitors. These provided atmosphere, creating the touristic conditions that made a day out ‘holiday like’. “The Sound is really nice... I like that there are always a lot of people there enjoying the setting... It (the island) can get lonely; it’s nice to share it with people” (J. Conservationist, Isle of Man). Inspiration for domestic tourism also came from the presence of visitors. Guest culture in the three islands was orientated towards enjoyment and exploration of local landscapes. This was for many residents a reminder not to take local landscapes for granted. “I think that if you live and work here then maybe you, you stop looking at your surroundings if you know what I mean. You start to see it the same way and you don’t get out there and enjoy it” M, Employee, Isle of Man.

Hence tourist culture was associated with providing entertainment opportunities. It was also linked to the appreciation of cultural and natural landscapes and participation in activities therein. Benefits of this included a stimulated sense of nostalgia or civic pride amongst inhabitants reminded of the value of their locale. “It really reminds you that where you live is somewhere beautiful, worth visiting” (KA. Resident, Isle of Man). Moreover, an associated spreading of conservation ethos was described by special interest group members. These spoke about the awareness generated by tourists, of the quality and importance of local environments. “Yeah and also awareness, that’s also the key. If people don’t know there is anything there to look after then why the hell would they look after it?” (K. Conservationist, Isle of Man). Mutual learning and motivation arising through host guest interactions could be harnessed to meet special interest group agendas.
4.4 Industry Stage and Scale and Tourist Culture

A number of differences in the significance or ease of observation of tourist culture were noted between cases. To illustrate, on the Isle of Man tourist culture was perhaps most identifiable. Here participants gave detailed descriptions of domestic tourism activity, host-guest relationships and cultural exchanges. Many examples of culture stimulated and enhanced by guest inputs were related and observed. “I think most ‘Manx’ culture is actually thanks to outsiders and the enthusiasm and input they bring… We are lucky to have them to draw upon” (V. Manager, Isle of Man). Yet here concern for continuing tourism decline was widespread. This was felt to undermine the benefits brought by tourism. “It isn’t like it was. There were so many facilities, so much atmosphere, always things going on. If you could have seen it. It was wonderful” (B. Resident, Isle of Man). The potential for tourism decline to undermine tourist culture was highlighted.

On Belle Ile, where tourism dominates the local economy; guest culture appeared to be somewhat overwhelming host culture, suggesting that overly large scale tourism can have a damaging effect. Several interviewees dismissed cultural events, festivals, arts and crafts available on the island, as pastiche, imports, and purely for the entertainment of visitors. Discussion was additionally of feeling overwhelmed at times by the volume of tourists. This crowding could make day to day life difficult. “It is so busy... (in the summer) you cannot see the beach for bodies” (B. Resident, Belle Ile). Invasions of privacy were recounted. One resident explained they could feel like a zookeeper shepherding and guiding tourists. Another of being rendered part of the scenery. Several comments were regards elitist or rude visitors who contributed little to local community. “Some of them (tourists) are very rude... they think you are here to do everything for them” (D. Tourism Employee, Belle Ile). There was evidence that host culture had retreated to an extent, in order to shelter from this. Coping strategies were ways islanders avoided some of the adverse impacts of tourism. Several Belle
Ile participants discussed altering their routines to account for inconveniences such as crowding. “It is difficult sometimes. If you just want to go shopping there are so many people… you adjust your routine… go out earlier and later when they (tourists) have gone” (B. Employee, Belle Ile).

On Lewis & Harris meanwhile, lesser experience of tourism may have limited the evolution of a tourist culture. Residents discussed feelings of ambivalence towards development rooted in concern for the cultural changes this might bring. Others expressed frustration at such perspective, desired greater change, faster, viewed current lifestyles as unsustainable, and hoped for tourism directed change. “I think some very local people think it is all going to change and that we’ll overnight be like Ibiza or whatever” (T, Lewis & Harris). Local craft produce had undoubtedly been stimulated by tourist interest however. Interviewees discussed the income and awareness generated for traditional products and industries, encouraging a new generation of entrepreneurs and artisans.

5.0 Discussion

Research identified existence of tourist culture in three small islands of northwest Europe. This was observed through the traditions, events and crafts, at least part revived, reinterpreted or created through the interactions of host and guest cultures.

Distinct host and guest cultures were observed. Fieldwork encountered tourists bringing their particular interests, leisure outlook and national backgrounds with them on holiday. Similarly experienced were the unique and varied indigenous cultures of three small northwest European islands. Gaelic, Norse and Saxon influences on the three islands were persistent, emphasising the resilience of host cultures.
These two cultures are found to be in close contact. From shared public spaces, through employment based interactions to deep personal contact including friendships, business and romantic partnerships, hosts and guests were closely intertwined. Such interactions encapsulate the potential for mutually rewarding outputs. Resulting stimulation of ideas and creativity had implications for the diversification of economic and environmental landscapes. Meanwhile, social landscapes were enriched through the increased social space and opportunities brought. Occasional friction between was recorded as has been elsewhere (see Kim and McKercher, 2011), but only minimally. This perhaps reflects the general cultural proximity of hosts and guests in the islands studied (although this is no guarantor of harmony (see Wilson, 1997)). It may also result from the mostly successful establishment of tourist culture in the cases, and the cultural accommodation, adaptability, inclusivity and lubrication this facilitates.

To illustrate, close contact between hosts and guests was found to have various outputs. Mutual influence and exchange arises. Drawing upon indigenous culture, tourist culture is shaped by the presence and input of visitors. Pennington-Gray et al. (2005) suggest it is evident cultures are not static, but susceptible to change, and diverse encounters and interactions between hosts and guests will cause this. Likewise, Brown (1998) concludes host communities and ecosystems are not static, but rather affected by and capable of change over time. Simpson (1993) highlights tourism can be generative in that it leads to the creation and recreation of new meanings for cultural objects and practises. Similarly Matheison and Wall (1992) consider the many examples of cultural art forms renaissance or deterioration because of tourism. Such processes were noted in the cases investigated. Events such as the Isle of Man TT are clearly the result of long processes of host and guest inputs. In this case the original impetus and ongoing tourist demand for the races, is matched by enthusiasm amongst many residents for participating, and the use of motorbike related symbols throughout local
expressions of Manx identity. Illustrated was the co-opting and co-creation of cultural outputs (Marwick, 2001; Smith, 2003; Lovelock, 2014).

Furthermore, the interest of tourists in natural and cultural landscapes appears to lead to reappraisals of these by local inhabitants. They may then develop business ideas, hence fostering entrepreneurial activity, or promote the spread of a conservation ethos (see Mathieson and Wall, 1992; Ayres, 2000; Smith, 2003). Others might build like-minded social networks with resulting exchanges of contacts and ideas, shown to lead to stakeholders involved with arts and crafts incorporating new ideas and findings new outlets for their expression (see Simpson, 1993; Tapper, 2001). Lastly, many residents are encouraged by the presence of tourists to partake themselves in exploring natural and cultural landscapes. Re-evaluations of these and added atmosphere contributed, together support local domestic tourism (as per Canavan, 2014).

In line with past literature, tourist culture could therefore be seen to bring a number of apparent benefits to small island communities. Liberalisation benefits could be identified. Increased opportunities for making like-minded friends, pursuing interests, or sexual expression, were all discussed by interviewees. Previous authors have noted the advantages of multiculturalism, pluralism and challenging patriarchy in peripheral locations (Brown, 1998; Smith, 2003; Hall and Boyd, 2005). Many residents in these cases expressed their appreciation of the cultural and ideas exchanges brought by guests, as they did frustrations at aspects of closed, narrow, and perhaps overly restrictive traditional cultures.

Creativity benefits were noted. Tourism appeared to support and stimulate cultural practises. Festivals, souvenirs, small scale manufacture, food products, and the like, rooted in traditional cultures and responding to tourist input, were found in all of the islands (as per Mathieson and Wall, 1992, Simpson, 1993, Marwick, 2001). The reappraisals stimulated by exchanges between hosts and guests moreover contributed to the goals of special interest
groups. A spread of conservation ethos and good practise was noted by interested stakeholders for instance.

Research also illustrated pragmatic benefits whereby residents took advantage of the events, festivals, traditions, crafts and souvenirs that emerge through host and guest interactions, for their own enjoyment. Domestic tourism was shown to be stimulated and enhanced by presence of foreign guests. Economic opportunities were also exploited. On the Isle of Man for instance, a number of participants provided rooms during the TT period to make extra income, and sometimes for the social aspect of doing so. Interested stakeholders in all islands meanwhile, used tourism for goals such as promoting conservation agendas.

Tourist culture could henceforth be seen as a liberalising influence, source of entertainment, exchange, creativity, and landscape diversity. It may also be a source of landscape reappraisal. Taking from the literature, a vibrant tourist culture suggests a shared, mutually evolved, mutually tolerant culture, based upon rather than exploiting the indigenous culture of a locale, and subsequently incorporating the experience and expertise of outsiders (see Smith, 1989; Simpson, 1993; Sindiga, 1996; Wilson, 1997; Butcher, 2003; Smith, 2003; Tao and Wall, 2009). It indicates a degree of intimacy between hosts and guests, potentially contributing to more harmonious relationships amongst. This is not the hostile environment between hosts and guests, with the former resentful of the disruptive presence of the latter (Van Ginkel, 1995; Van der Duim and Lengkeek, 2004; Sanchez and Adams, 2008). Nor is it the exclusive enclave tourism, criticised for the latter interacting little with and contributing little to local culture (Cohen and Neal, 2012), or the voyeuristic forms of tourism, such as favela gazing, which are similarly one rather than two way (Frisch, 2012). Rather, tourist culture appears to emerge from tourism which is well integrated, where local inhabitants are involved, and where positive impacts of the sector are well developed. As such, it may be
symptomatic of tourism which is particularly sustainable. Likewise it may indicate communities which are engaged, vibrant and henceforth long-term habitable.

Yet differences in the extent of tourist culture were noted across the three islands reviewed. Such findings were largely as expected, in light of the notions of time and balance being important to tourist culture evolution (Smith, 1989; Cooper, 1995; Sindiga, 1996). Briefly speaking, tourist culture was less well developed in Lewis & Harris. Here the benefits brought by tourist culture were less established. Frustrations, such as with a sometimes overly traditional culture, were more commonly expressed and several participants hoped that greater tourism in future would bring change, such as relaxation of religious observance, and thus make the island a more attractive place to live.

Fieldwork in Belle Ile revealed indigenous culture had been somewhat displaced by the presence of tourism. Sheer visitor numbers can crowd out and make hard to observe host culture. As discussed in the literature, hosting tourists can be culturally destructive as well as generative. To illustrate, the physical pressure of tourist crowding causes social change, congestion, resource damage, acts as a physical burden on everyday life, and subsumes integrity and traditions of the local culture (Smith, 1989; Briassoulis, 2004; Rodriguez et al, 2008; Royle, 2008). Guest rather than tourist culture may predominate as a result. Events and crafts available locally might be pastiche rather than mutually negotiated, evolved and used for instance.

In the Isle of Man meanwhile, tourist culture was much evidenced in the island’s cultural scene. From architecture, through to public facilities, to events, and art forms, the influences and outcomes of hosting tourism are pervasive. Local inhabitants participate in, shape and benefit from this presence. Yet common fears were shared for the decline in tourism placing under threat. Ongoing loss of facilities and an increased sense of isolation was much discussed during interviews.
Henceforth, findings illustrate the evolution of tourist culture may be uncertain and fragile. Research highlights that tourist culture is something which can contribute to and exemplify sustainable tourism. At the same time, it needs active and on-going monitoring and management if it is to develop and be maintained.

Conclusion

The overall contribution of this research is to identify and describe tourist culture and subsequently relate that phenomenon to sustainable tourism debate. Findings were of the presence of host and guest cultures which interact and generate new cultural artefacts and practises as a result. Present in each case was tourism stimulated cultural expressions, such as crafts, festivals, storytelling and dancing. Research thus supports a host-guest nexus perspective of tourist culture.

Research also highlights associations between presence of tourist culture and sustainability of tourism. Findings were that tourism diversified island landscapes and made the islands more viable and attractive places to inhabit. The presence of tourist culture in a locale would appear to be symptomatic of more mutually rewarding forms of development. Tourist culture may be a sign of tourism that is well integrated into a locale, over longer time periods and participated in by local inhabitants. It is rooted in and often celebrates local indigenous culture, a process which may contribute to the continuation of these in the islands reviewed. Brought at the same time are sought after engagement, exchanges and ideas that can stimulate revivals, new expressions, combinations and dissemination of that culture.

Nevertheless, the potential for limitations in tourist culture evolution were identified. Differences in tourist culture were noted relating to scale and stage of tourism development. In the Isle of Man tourism decline threatens to undermine this uniquely evolved culture. In
Lewis & Harris the industry remains small scale and of limited impact. And in Belle Ile, tourism has become so dominant it may threaten to destabilise the more nuanced and mutually negotiated process of tourist culture evolution. This being the case, research calls attention to the use of tourist culture as a sign of more sustainable forms of tourism development, and also highlights the need for careful stewardship if that sustainability is to be achieved and then maintained.
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