

16 Work it out

Using work as participant observation to study tourism

Chris McMorran

All tourism students have experienced that moment – at a dinner party, or the first day of a course – when we announce that we study tourism, only to have others smirk and make comments like, ‘Why didn’t I think of that?’ The implication is that studying tourism is easy. My research in Japanese hot springs villages (*onsen*) brings even more misunderstanding. ‘Wow, that must be really rough!’ Friends joke about me soaking in baths, towel wrapped around my head and a scuba diver’s pen in hand, interviewing whoever happens to be nearby. There is a sense of decadence to such research, and especially for colleagues who study the Greenland ice sheets or villages in the Andean highlands, there is envy of the field site’s accessibility.

Research in a tourist destination presents far fewer initial roadblocks than research in, say, a prison, a diamond mine, or even an executive office, which may be difficult to reach or require special permission to enter (Thomas 1995; Mullings 1999). Tourist sites are usually very accessible and actively encourage visitors. However, the qualities that make tourism attractive and seemingly easy to research can also create the greatest obstacles. Tourist destinations are structured specifically to welcome money-spending visitors. Even the planned display of backstage areas is done for tourists, *not* researchers (MacCannell 1999). Thus, the researcher must constantly justify his or her presence in tourist space. Also, the complex power relations that shape tourist destinations, stemming primarily from land ownership and labour control, are hidden from view in order to preserve an overall harmonious effect. Labour unions are rare, and the friendly smiles of workers help conceal dissatisfactions. Therefore, research into the human relations found in a tourist destination requires a delicate negotiation of one’s position with regard to workers and the powerful local elites who recruit and manage labour.

My interests in political economy and feminist perspectives led to research questions and methodologies that promised to be more emotionally taxing than conducting interviews while bathing. After visits to several hot springs villages in Kumamoto Prefecture, located on the island of Kyushu, I became interested in the gendered work relations found in a particular style of accommodation called *ryokan*. The term *ryokan* is composed of the characters

for ‘travel’, *ryo*, and ‘residence’, *kan*, which combine to mean ‘inn’. The most common translation is ‘Japanese style inn’, which is intended to differentiate the *ryokan* from a Western-style hotel. While most small *ryokan* are staffed by the owner-family, larger *ryokan* demand more labour to serve guests, clean rooms, prepare meals, scrub baths, and answer phones. In a pilot study I learned that, while even larger *ryokan* felt homelike, the labour pool consisted mostly of domestic migrant workers. Many of these workers were older women who had left their own homes for jobs in *ryokan*, meaning that a highly mobile workforce was employed to create a feeling of home for guests. This became the conundrum at the heart of my research plan.

I decided to accept the ethnographical challenge proposed by Clifford: ‘Why not focus on any culture’s farthest range of travel while *also* looking at its centers, its villages, its intensive fieldsites?’ (1997: 25). Studying a *ryokan* would allow me to do both, since the field site was a tourist destination that also promoted itself as a cohesive village. Although the *ryokan* is not the *farthest* range of Japanese travel, the proposed research site was located in a remote mountainous location, hours from the nearest city and built to represent a potentially vanishing, traditional, and rural Other standing opposed to modern urban society. This made the *ryokan* distant from its guests in both time and space (Ivy 1995; McMorran 2008). In general, I wanted to talk to both *ryokan* owners and workers to learn how workers were recruited and trained for their positions, the reasons that workers chose this line of work, and the relations that developed between management and labour. Did the *ryokan* become a surrogate home for migrant workers? Did the workers and management share a family spirit, as some owners previously told me? And what attracted so many migrant workers to work in *ryokan* in the first place?

Research methodology courses typically emphasize the importance of choosing the method that best suits one’s research questions. In the following I describe the evolution of my methods to fit my questions, given an ever-growing awareness of the special characteristics of my field site. I chart the methodological obstacles I faced in the field, most of which involved negotiating my presence within several matrices of power. These included: (1) negotiating past a strict host–guest relationship that prevented backstage access to the site; (2) both requesting and limiting the assistance (and potential interference) of *ryokan* owners; and (3) subjecting myself to some of the same unequal power relationships experienced by *ryokan* workers. In the end, I used participant observation as an employee in a *ryokan* to investigate my research questions. As a result, I advocate using work to actively engage the processes being studied in tourist destinations. I call on students of tourism, especially those with an interest in labour relations, to put down their tape recorders and notebooks for a few hours and wash some dishes. This will open lines of communication with informants and help mitigate the researcher’s role in power-imbued relations.

Negotiating powerful spaces, or getting past the lobby

The first obstacle to my research was the physical separation of the tourist setting into front- and backstage settings (MacCannell 1999). In other words, I had trouble getting past the lobby to meet potential research subjects. The *ryokan* is organized spatially like a Japanese home. The *genkan* (entrance) is considered a liminal space that is part public, part private, while the rooms beyond become increasingly private and off-limits. In many homes, a visitor can step right into the *genkan* after saying a perfunctory *shitsureishimasu* (excuse me). Most interaction with salespeople and other non-guests is handled in this liminal space. Only houseguests are invited to remove their shoes and actually enter the home, although guests often are restricted from entering some rooms, like the kitchen and bedrooms. The *ryokan* lobby resembles a home's *genkan*. Because the door to the *ryokan* usually remains open, all visitors can freely enter the lobby, but non-guests likely will not be able to proceed past the entrance.

My first method for investigating labour relations in *ryokan* involved simply walking in off the street and starting a conversation with the front staff. I hoped to make a good first impression and arrange a meeting afterwards with this person, in which a longer interview could take place. I also longed for a short tour of the inn, during which I could meet other workers and schedule interviews with them as well. When I first walked into a *ryokan* for my pilot study, a young man in a simple dark blue uniform warmly greeted me, 'Irasshaimase', I stepped into the lobby and momentarily lost myself in the reassuring position of a guest in a country renowned for its customer service. The lobby's highly polished wooden floor glowed a deep, dark brown, and the flower arrangement by the door had a rustic simplicity quite different from those I had seen in the large hotels of Osaka and Tokyo. The clerk's friendly demeanour immediately set me at ease, and I hoped that this would translate into open reception of my research. Joining him at the counter, I offered my name card, indicating my affiliation with a prestigious Japanese university, and began to explain my purpose.

However, it soon became clear that since I was neither an overnight guest nor a day visitor for the bath, the clerk did not know how to react. My introduction was interrupted with various 'huh?'s and 'ehh . . .'s, as he was faced with a situation for which he had received no training. Not only did I struggle to justify my unexpected presence in that space, but I soon became a nuisance, as the telephone started ringing, followed by a deliveryman picking up the day's laundry. I wanted to ask this young man about his working experience and his relationship with the owners, but the space was not designed to permit this tangential use (see also Adler and Adler 2004). He expected to play the role of front desk clerk to my role of guest. Because I did not fulfil my role, he could not fulfil his. I wanted to meet the dozens of other workers in the building. However, I could feel him pulling away, sealing off access both to himself and the others. In meetings with clerks at other *ryokan*,

I again interfered with their jobs. In rare cases when a clerk was not too busy to talk, the answers felt forced. The clerk's role as a polite, welcoming individual required him or her to assist me, even if this contradicted his or her real desires. And all of this talk with front desk clerks still did not get me past the lobby.

These initial forays into studying labour in a *ryokan* brought a great deal of guilt and self-doubt. How could I move beyond the lobby, and more importantly, how could I physically be in a *ryokan* without being considered a guest? Being treated like a guest meant being placed in a position of respect, which would then create an imbalance of power in which the worker felt compelled to answer questions. This felt unethical, as it did not ensure the voluntary cooperation of research subjects. Plus, it was unreasonable to spend endless days sitting in *ryokan* lobbies, disturbing workers or watching them from across the room. The spatial organization of the *ryokan* and the roles expected to be performed conflicted with my research goals. Clearly, I needed another method and a different venue to meet informants.

Positionality and power: gatekeepers and vulnerable subjects

Part of the problem with striking up a conversation with a *ryokan* worker is that, despite the public feel of the entrance, the *ryokan* is private property. Thus, I was ethically required to obtain permission from the inn's owners before talking to any workers. I was aware of the importance of personal introductions to gaining access to information and people in Japan; however, when it came to accessing workers for interviews, I was wary of using the owners as my intermediary. A trusted local contact suggested the owners could *convince* their workers to cooperate with my study, but this suggested coercion and would prevent investigation of my research questions. I wanted to avoid the experience of Mullings in her study of global economic restructuring and information processing firms in Jamaica, in which one manager told employees, 'Go and answer the questions that the lady outside want[s] to know' (1999: 342). Needless to say, the workers were reluctant to participate, and those who did often feared that Mullings would reveal their responses to either the government or management.

As both a social scientist and a human being, I wanted to ensure the voluntary participation of my research subjects and assure participants that I would protect their anonymity. Therefore, I was eager to avoid using the subtle or overt pressure of bosses to meet informants. The demographics of the *ryokan* labour force added further concern to the problem of voluntary participation. The bulk of the labour demand at *ryokan* is for *nakai*, the person (almost exclusively a woman) who serves the evening and morning meals and cleans guestrooms after checkout. A typical inn will have one *nakai* for every two to three rooms, so a medium-sized inn with 20 rooms will employ around 10 *nakai*. The *ryokan* is well known for providing a favourable employment option for women aged 40 to 65 who are divorced, widowed, or

otherwise separated from the relative economic security of marriage. In addition to income, workers receive accommodation in dormitories, uniforms, three meals a day, and a job that requires no technical skills. Larger *ryokan* often offer childcare, which is especially attractive to young mothers with small children who may be going through divorce or leaving an abusive relationship. Far from individuals freely selling their labour as equal participants in a relationship with the owners of capital, women who migrate to work in *ryokan* tend to be especially vulnerable to the influence of their employers. How could I speak with these workers without becoming intertwined in a complex web of power relations in which the workers potentially felt at risk of losing much more than just a job? How could I receive approval from their bosses, yet avoid the coerced participation of workers? Finally, how could I convince these vulnerable workers to open up to a foreign male researcher?

One idea was to bypass permission of the *ryokan* owners and contact workers when they were not at the *ryokan*. This would help balance our relationship by removing the host-guest association and the possibility of coercion from the owner. We would just be two people having a conversation, with our relationship defined neither by tourism nor a powerful gatekeeper. But how would I identify someone as a *ryokan* worker? Would I wait outside the employee entrance of inns and hand out business cards? This felt like stalking. Could I ask my local contact to arrange individual meetings with workers and hope for a snowball effect? This seemed to give too much power to yet another intermediary gatekeeper (Oakes 2005). And would workers even talk about their work relations without the permission of their bosses? While I knew that I should request permission from *ryokan* owners to conduct research on the *ryokan* premises, my local contact made it seem that I would need the owners' permission to interview workers *outside* the workplace as well, even if I avoided questions about their specific *ryokan*. I was beginning to feel that I was running out of suitable options.

While thinking about these problems, a more difficult and practical question struck me: *when* would I meet workers? My images of long evening talks at informants' dinner tables quickly evaporated as I learned of their demanding work schedules. Like labour in all tourist destinations, *ryokan* workers must adapt to the needs of guests. Work at a *ryokan* involves preparing and feeding guests both dinner and breakfast, as well as cleaning their rooms after checkout. Thus, a *ryokan* requires labour at staggered times of the day. Most employees (except the front desk clerk) work from 7.30 a.m. to 12.00 p.m., then again from 3.00 p.m. to the end of the day, usually 9.00 or 10.00 p.m., leaving only three hours in the middle of the day during which I feasibly could conduct interviews. However, I soon discovered that these hours were cherished for running errands, taking walks, watching television, or napping, a common habit amid the 10- to 11-hour workday. And most workers have only five or six days off per month, during which they catch up on laundry, visit relatives, or escape elsewhere to shop and relax. In most

cases, I could not bring myself to ask workers to sacrifice this precious time for me.

Clearly, my research questions and the specific characteristics of the fieldwork site meant that there was no single, perfect methodological solution. I had to balance constraints of space and time, the practical 'where and when' of fieldwork, with more conceptual, yet no less critical, worries about negotiating my presence within and around various matrices of power. As a relatively young, non-Japanese male proposing to investigate mostly older Japanese women, I had to conceive of a way to mitigate the power differential that could arise from our vast differences. I did not want to be seen as an outside expert or a spy working for the *ryokan* owner. I did not want to trivialize or romanticize their work as quaintly 'cultural' or 'traditional', especially while working within a political economy and feminist-inspired perspective. And, although I would have ultimate control over the collection and interpretation of the data, as well as the final published product, I wanted to conduct the fieldwork in a way that attempted to minimize my power in the moment.

Working it out: participant observation as an employee

A local professor finally suggested a solution to my methodological quandary: work in a *ryokan*. In hindsight this choice seems obvious, but at the time I could not imagine how the plan would work. Who would hire a foreigner to work in such a purposefully Japanese place, and what job could I do? Fortunately, the informal nature of the *ryokan* industry meant that some obstacles, like a work visa and job contract, were never mentioned. I am still unsure of the legality of the arrangement, but it served the interests of both the inn and the research to ignore such matters. I was simply a friend of a friend offering to help a short-handed family business. A *ryokan* owner gladly accepted me as a researcher who wanted to experience work in a *ryokan* and talk to co-workers about their own experiences.

As a worker, I immediately entered into a locally significant *senpai-kohai* (senior-junior) relationship with the others. I was the humble junior relying on my seniors for advice and instruction. For women who believe that their poor educational background means that they have no knowledge worth sharing, I was able to turn any potential education-based power imbalance on its head. My advanced degrees were useless in this context. England (1994: 82) refers to this position as 'researcher-as-suppliant', which 'is predicated upon an unequivocal acceptance that the knowledge of the person being researched (at least regarding the particular questions being asked) is greater than that of the researcher'. While researchers interviewing powerful elites may need to exaggerate their intelligence or importance to gain respect (Schoenberger 1991; Mullings 1999), I found that the less I knew about the job but was eager to learn, the more willing the *nakai* were to both teach me and subsequently open up to me. Although the *nakai* often told

me that their job required no skills – ‘It’s not difficult, anyone can do it’; ‘This is just what I did as a housewife for 20 years’ – my initial ignorance of the proper way to fold a futon or the importance of turning around a guest’s slippers in a doorway, showed the *nakai* that their knowledge trumped institutional learning.

Two final aspects essential to understanding my relationship with *nakai* was my foreignness and maleness. Because my study centred on the particularly Japanese economic and cultural space of the *ryokan*, my initial ignorance of the work necessary to reproduce it and my desire to learn what workers called the ‘Japanese way’ (*nihon no yarikata*) minimized any possible power imbalance based on being a foreigner. I had no designs for imposing Western management practices on a Japanese business, and I had no illusions of instructing women in their fifties and sixties how to do domestic tasks that they had performed over their entire adult lives. Finally, as a male in a predominantly women’s world, my eagerness to learn tasks considered ‘women’s work’ helped diminish any possible power difference due to sex. I was reminded daily of my differences, but by purposefully placing myself in a position subordinate to the workers I was able to gain their trust and observe their interactions (England 1994).

Accepting a position as a worker meant sacrificing some of the freedoms enjoyed by other researchers in the field. I was not able to spend hours each day exploring the area, walking down random alleyways and chatting with passers-by. The particularities of my field site required a different approach. Plus, I found that the mobility afforded a researcher in the field stood in great contrast to the often-restrictive embeddedness of the people with whom I wanted to talk (see Kondo 1990). Therefore, I willingly gave up some freedom in order to gain a clearer understanding of the impacts of work on people’s lives, which better fit my research goals.

Importantly, this method placed me in a relation to capital similar to that of workers. Because my dissertation research absolutely depended on this experience, like the workers I was largely unable to resist the demands of the *ryokan* owners. I, too, desperately needed the position and sacrificed my time and energy for the *ryokan* owner’s profit. Thus, instead of simply observing a workplace, I allowed myself to be manipulated by it, which went far toward mitigating class differences and building solidarity and trust with workers. Selling my labour to the *ryokan* meant obeying a regular schedule, arriving at 7.30 a.m. and working 10 or more hours a day, five to six days a week. It also meant working mandatory unpaid overtime without prior notice, providing a taxi service for the owner’s family members, having my work schedule changed at short notice, and cleaning up after guests, no matter how repulsive the mess. Being on the receiving end of blatant violations of Japanese labour laws and seeing the liberties taken with labour by *ryokan* owners enabled me to immediately speak with workers about the harsh realities of working in a *ryokan*, as well as the joys of meeting new guests every day and building relationships with co-workers.

I could have asked to simply shadow workers and speak with them as they worked. However, the constant movement required of *nakai*, especially when cleaning rooms or delivering food, meant that the *nakai* would be literally tripping over me as they worked. Plus, as anyone who has ever moved house or washed dishes in front of an idle spectator knows, it can be difficult to resist asking such a person the frustratingly obvious question/suggestion: ‘Why don’t you make yourself useful?’ Prompting such a reaction would not put me in good stead with the workers and would highlight my privileged position as someone who, in the eyes of workers, was *not* working (Kurotani 2005). Kurotani discusses her participant observation with the wives of men who have been transferred to work in Japanese corporations in the United States. Since her research often involved chatting with groups of Japanese women during their informal afternoon meetings at each other’s homes, Kurotani was often considered an *asobimono*, or one who always plays. She could not explain that her work, research, was being conducted precisely during the time that the other women considered their break time.

Benefits and drawbacks

Before working at a *ryokan*, I had difficulty accessing workers and arranging time to meet them. The most important benefit of using work as a methodology was that it allowed hours of unpressured time with workers, where conversations about their work histories and relations with guests and management could be removed from the weighted idea of an ‘interview’, and instead be seen as chitchat that helped speed the work day along. My co-workers imagined interviews to be somewhat confrontational interactions that were only appropriate for people in powerful positions. They preferred the informality of chatting while working, with its stops and starts and its tendency towards gossip and complaints. This provided opportunities to ask all of the questions that I could not have asked even over the course of dozens of interviews. Like most *nakai*, one woman with whom I worked refused an interview from day one. However, she often invited me along for walks during our afternoon breaks. For around an hour we two would hunt for chestnuts or the latest flowers in bloom. She also spoke candidly about single-handedly raising two children, earning a meagre living as a seamstress, then, once her children had grown and moved away, accepting a job as a *nakai*. She detailed her ambivalent relations with the company and other employees and shared more than I could have ever hoped for with a simple interview. Near the end of my stay I jokingly asked her again for an interview, to which she laughingly replied, ‘No. Anyway, I already told you everything.’ She was willing to answer all of my questions and more, but not under the auspices of an official, power-charged ‘interview’.

Working alongside informants also solved the age-old predicament of *where* to conduct interviews (Elwood and Martin 2000). This may be an afterthought in research involving politicians, academics, business managers,

or others who have offices; however, there are few locations in which to have a long, uninterrupted conversation with a *nakai*. Since most *ryokan* owners forbid members of the opposite sex from entering worker dormitories, and most *nakai* find visits inappropriate or inconvenient, interviews in the rooms of *nakai* were out of the question. As workers who are in the semi-public eye for most of the day, *nakai* tend not to want to be seen in public during their breaks, which also made interviews in cafés or restaurants problematic. However, while working, short interviews could take place in such unofficial locations as the pantry next to the dining room, where dinner trays were prepared, or in guestrooms while cleaning or putting away futons.

Quite possibly my best 'interview' took place in the dining room when a *nakai* requested my help with a one-day-only job of filling lotion bottles. This task required little concentration and allowed us to talk freely for two undisturbed hours. With little persuasion, she proudly described her first job over 40 years ago, working as the only woman at a company that treated her as an equal and respected her for her accounting skills. She was trained to operate the company's first calculator, which she used to calculate the staff's wages. However, her career ended upon marriage, since she quit her job like so many other new brides do. Unfortunately, her marriage ended several years later in divorce. She has regretted her choice to quit her job ever since, because her lack of continuous skill development has given her little choice but to accept a lifetime of unskilled jobs. Another major reason for her lack of career choices is due to the fact that she quit her position in mid-career. Especially for women, and less so for men, one's initial job following education is critical. Since nearly all labour recruitment is done directly out of university, trade schools or high school, it is very difficult to enter the workforce as a full-time employee after a certain age or after one has already ended a career elsewhere. Now in her mid-sixties and without a home, she works to stay youthful and active, and to save some money before (hopefully) moving into her daughter's home after retirement. These and other examples of impromptu discussion show how the continuity of the methodology of work ensured an endless array of opportunities to witness and directly speak with workers about their relations with one another and with the owners of capital outside the stuffy confines of a traditional 'interview'.

The main drawback of this method is that it required the permission of a *ryokan* owner, again placing me in the position of relying on a powerful individual for access to workers. This presented a methodological issue that remains unresolved in my mind to this day. My position as a worker forced others to work with me. Even those who might not want to participate in any ethnographic research suddenly found themselves washing dishes and laying out futons with a geographer. Was it ethical of me to write about these experiences and snippets of conversation? Was it fair for me to consider their actions and comments 'on the record'? On day one, I introduced myself, described the purpose of my study, and assured all that I would use my observations solely for academic purposes and maintain their individual

anonymity. I passed out copies of my release form, and all glanced at it and verbally agreed to it. But did they really have a choice in the matter? To not agree would have been difficult in front of their peers and in front of me, who at that point was still considered a guest. And because the inn was incredibly busy, many of them did not care about the research part; they were just happy to have an extra helping hand.

I conducted participant observation in the spirit of voluntary participation by the subjects. Therefore, I always let others ask the first questions. If they expressed interest in my private life, I felt that I could ask similar questions. (I only asked private questions when no other workers were nearby. I vowed to not ask any questions of workers who did not initiate their own questions about me. However, by the end of the second or third day, every worker had asked me very personal questions about my family, my income, my student status, and my home life.) By the first few days, everyone knew most of my life history, either through direct discussion or through the grapevine. As a researcher hoping to ask personal questions of the informants, I had to first open myself to their questions. This further allowed me to balance the power inherent in a typical researcher-informant relationship. By showing my vulnerability and sharing my secrets, the workers could feel that I was not just digging for bits of information from a safe distance. I had to be an open book in order to justify my writing of my co-workers' lives.

Conclusions

A year before I began work in a *ryokan* I had the experience of shadowing workers one morning as they cleaned rooms. I followed *nakai* with a notebook as they replaced toothbrushes, washed teapots, placed clean towels in closets and vacuumed floors. They were willing to talk, but I constantly felt in the way (because, as I later found out, I was). Simply put, the difference between watching work and wiping off a table completely changed the relationship between researcher and researched. As solely observer, I was difficult for them to fathom. One worker later said of that first visit: 'I thought, "Who is this strange *gaijin* [foreigner] following me around asking all of these questions?"' However, as a worker my presence in the *ryokan* made sense. I was able to move past the entrance and past the powerful role of guest. Because tourist space is specifically constructed for guests and the people who serve them, tourism researchers must strive to meet the challenge of not perfectly fitting into either of these categories. I found this was best achieved by using work as a form of participant observation.

Another crucial benefit from working in the *ryokan* was that it allowed me to negate any possibility that I would be seen as an agent of the inn owner. One of my biggest fears from the beginning of the research was that workers would suspect that I was spying on them for the owners, which several workers later told me had been the case. However, over time, their fears subsided as they complained ever more loudly about their lack of pay rises or bonuses,

their long hours, the constant shortage of employees, and the tightfisted and inefficient practices of management. I firmly believe that these are neither the kinds of comments that I would ever have heard from a front desk clerk while standing in the lobby as a guest, nor the comments that anyone would write on a survey administered by an anonymous scholar. I was able to mitigate the powerful influences of the owners of capital by not aligning myself with them and instead subjecting myself to the same matrices of power experienced by the workers. Therefore, I was able to share the workers' experience and understand their complaints, as well as their powerlessness to ask for better conditions. Also, I was able to mitigate any possible imbalances of power based on class, educational attainment, nationality or sex through my acceptance of the role of learner of the *nakai* knowledge.

Finally, using work as a form of observation provided a level of ongoing contact with the location and study population that would have been impossible with any other method. One of the frustrations of an interview is that it ends. On the other hand, working in a *ryokan* was like a year-long interview with a group of people who normally feel that their life stories and opinions are of little import and not worthy of academic study. Every day provided a rich new source of situations that could be mined by talking with the numerous other employees all around. And while there may be no ideal place to interview a *nakai*, the physical layout of the *ryokan* enabled hundreds of impromptu micro-interviews that, when pieced together, reveal a colourful mosaic of the everyday working life of a tourist destination. Using the method of working as participant observation can serve tourism researchers anxious to mitigate (but not erase) the relations of power inherent in tourist destinations.

References

- Adler, P.A. and Adler, P. (2004) *Paradise Laborers: Hotel Work in the Global Economy*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Clifford, J. (1997) *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Elwood, S. and Martin, D. (2000) '“Placing” Interviews: Location and Scales of Power in Qualitative Research', *Professional Geographer* 52(4): 649–57.
- England, K. (1994) 'Getting Personal: Reflexivity, Positionality, and Feminist Research', *Professional Geographer* 46(1): 80–9.
- Ivy, M. (1995) *Discourses of the Vanishing: Modernity, Phantasm, Japan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kondo, D. (1990) *Crafting Selves: Power, Gender, and Discourses of Identity in a Japanese Workplace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kurotani, S. (2005) *Home Away from Home: Japanese Corporate Wives in the United States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- MacCannell, D. (1999) *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- McMorran, C. (2008) 'Understanding the “Heritage” in Heritage Tourism: Ideological

- Tool or Economic Tool for a Japanese Hot Springs Resort?', *Tourism Geographies* 10(3): 334–54.
- Mullings, B. (1999) 'Insider or Outsider, Both or Neither: Some Dilemmas of Interviewing in a Cross-cultural Setting', *Geoforum* 30(4): 337–50.
- Oakes, T. (2005) 'The Story of Secretary Wang: Hero, Savior, Liar, Scoundrel', *University of California International and Area Studies: Global Field Notes*. Paper 5 (1 December 2005).
- Schoenberger, E. (1991) 'The Corporate Interview as a Research Method in Economic Geography', *Professional Geographer* 43(2): 180–9.
- Thomas, R. (1995) 'Interviewing Important People in Big Companies', in H. Hertz and J. Imber (eds), *Studying Elites Using Qualitative Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

**Tourism, Performance and
the Everyday**

Consuming the Orient

Michael Haldrup and Jonas Larsen

Tourism and Change in Polar Regions

Edited by C. Michael Hall and

Jarkko Saarinen

Fieldwork in Tourism

Methods, Issues and Reflections

Edited by C. Michael Hall

Forthcoming:

Tourist Development in India

Kevin Hannam and Anya Diekmann

Volunteer Tourism

Angela Benson

Political Economy of Tourism

Jan Mosedale

The Study of Tourism

Richard Sharpley

Children's and Families'

Holiday Experience

Neil Carr

Tourism and Agriculture

Rebecca Torres and Janet Momsen

Gender and Tourism

Cara Atchinson

Tourism in China

David Airey and King Chong

Real Tourism

Claudio Minca and Tim Oaks

Tourism and Animal Ethics

David A. Fennell

Tourism and National Identity

Elspeth Frew and Leanne White

Fieldwork in Tourism

Methods, issues and reflections

Edited by C. Michael Hall

