

TOWARD A SOCIOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL TOURISM¹

BY ERIK COHEN

IN recent years, there has been an enormous rise in both the number of people traveling for pleasure and the number of countries and places visited regularly by tourists. Sociologists, however, seem to have neglected the study of tourism as a social phenomenon.² Here I should like to propose a general theoretical approach to the phenomenon of international tourism, one which includes a typology of tourists on the basis of their relationship to both the tourist business establishment and the host country.

Varieties of Tourist Experience

“After seeing the jewels at Topkapi, the fabled Blue Mosque and bazaars, it’s awfully nice to come home to the Istanbul Hilton”

(Advertisement in *Time* magazine)

Tourism is so widespread and accepted today, particularly in the Western world,³ that we tend to take it for granted. Travel-

¹ This paper was first written while I was a visiting scholar at the Institute of Urban Environment, Columbia University, New York. Thanks are due to the Institute as well as to Dr. R. Bar-Yoseph, Prof. Elihu Katz, and Dr. M. Shokeid, for their useful comments.

² There exist very few full-length studies of tourism. One of the most comprehensive studies is that by H. J. Knebel, *Soziologische Strukturwandlungen im Modernen Tourismus* (Stuttgart: F. Enke Verl., 1960). By far the most incisive analysis of American tourism has been performed by D. Boorstin, *The Image*, (New York: Atheneum, 1962), pp. 77–117. There is a chapter on tourism in J. Dumazedier, *Towards a Society of Leisure* (New York: Free Press, 1967), pp. 123–128, and in M. Kaplan, *Leisure in America: A Social Inquiry* (New York: Wiley, 1960), Ch. 16.

³ For the contemporary tourist boom see S. K. Waters, “The American Tourist,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Social Science*, 368 (November 1966), pp. 109–118.

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

165

ing for pleasure in a foreign country by large numbers of people is a relatively modern occurrence, however, dating only from the early nineteenth century.⁴

It seems that mass tourism as a cultural phenomenon evolves as a result of a very basic change in man's attitude to the world beyond the boundaries of his native habitat. So long as man remains largely ignorant of the existence of other societies, other cultures, he regards his own small world as the cosmos. What lies outside is mysterious and unknown and therefore dangerous and threatening. It can only inspire fear or, at best, indifference, lacking as it does any reality for him.

A tremendous distance lies between such an orientation and that characteristic of modern man. Whereas primitive and traditional man will leave his native habitat only when forced to by extreme circumstances, modern man is more loosely attached to his environment, much more willing to change it, especially temporarily, and is remarkably able to adapt to new environments. He is interested in things, sights, customs, and cultures different from his own, precisely *because* they are different. Gradually, a new value has evolved: the appreciation of the experience of strangeness and novelty. This experience now excites, titillates, and gratifies, whereas before it only frightened. I believe that tourism as a cultural phenomenon becomes possible only when man develops a *generalized* interest in things beyond his particular habitat, when contact with and appreciation and enjoyment of strangeness and novelty are valued for their *own sake*. In this sense, tourism is a thoroughly modern phenomenon.

An increased awareness of the outer world seems to lead to an increased readiness to leave one's habitat and to wander around temporarily, or even to emigrate to another habitat. Although we have little real knowledge of the way in which this awareness grows, it would seem that the technological achievements of the past two centuries have been prime determinants.

⁴ Dumazedier, *op. cit.*, p. 125n. For the scarcity of tourists even as late as 1860, see Boorstin, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

While the invention of increasingly effective means of communication and the increasingly widespread availability and use of these means helped make man more aware of the outside world, at the same time a parallel phenomenon occurred in transportation, making travel less arduous, less dangerous, and less time-consuming. Also, the creation and growth of a monied middle class in many societies made traveling for pleasure a possibility for large numbers of people, whereas even as recently as the early nineteenth century only the aristocracy could afford the necessary expenditure in money and time.

Though novelty and strangeness are essential elements in the tourist experience, not even modern man is completely ready to immerse himself wholly in an alien environment. When the experience becomes too strange he may shrink back. For man is still basically molded by his native culture and bound through habit to its patterns of behavior. Hence, complete abandonment of these customs and complete immersion in a new and alien environment may be experienced as unpleasant and even threatening, especially if prolonged. Most tourists seem to need something familiar around them, something to remind them of home, whether it be food, newspapers, living quarters, or another person from their native country. Many of today's tourists are able to enjoy the experience of change and novelty only from a strong base of familiarity, which enables them to feel secure enough to enjoy the strangeness of what they experience. They would like to experience the novelty of the macroenvironment of a strange place from the security of a familiar microenvironment. And many will not venture abroad but on those well-trodden paths equipped with familiar means of transportation, hotels, and food. Often the modern tourist is not so much abandoning his accustomed environment for a new one as he is being transposed to foreign soil in an "environmental bubble" of his native culture. To a certain extent he views the people, places, and culture of that society through the protective walls of his familiar "en-

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

167

vironmental bubble," within which he functions and interacts in much the same way as he does in his own habitat.⁵

The experience of tourism combines, then, a degree of novelty with a degree of familiarity, the security of old habits with the excitement of change.⁶ However, the exact extent to which familiarity and novelty are experienced on any particular tour depends upon the individual tastes and preferences of the tourist as well as upon the institutional setting of his trip. There is a continuum of possible combinations of novelty and familiarity. This continuum is, to my mind, the basic underlying variable for the sociological analysis of the phenomenon of modern tourism. The division of the continuum into a number of typical combinations of novelty and familiarity leads to a typology of tourist experiences and roles. I will propose here a typology of four tourist roles.⁷

The organized mass tourist. The organized mass tourist is the least adventurous and remains largely confined to his "environmental bubble" throughout his trip. The guided tour, conducted in an air-conditioned bus, traveling at high speed through a steaming countryside, represents the prototype of the organized mass tourist. This tourist type buys a package-tour as if it were just another commodity in the modern mass market. The itinerary of his trip is fixed in advance, and all his stops are well-prepared and guided; he makes almost no decisions for himself and stays almost exclusively in the microenvironment of his home country. Familiarity is at a maximum, novelty at a minimum.

The individual mass tourist. This type of tourist role is similar to the previous one, except that the tour is not entirely preplanned, the tourist has a certain amount of control over his time and itinerary and is not bound to a group. However, all of his major arrange-

⁵ Knebel speaks, following von Uexküll, of a "*touristische Eigenwelt*," from which the modern tourist can no longer escape; *op. cit.*, p. 137.

⁶ For a similar approach to modern tourism, see Boorstin, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

⁷ For a different typology of tourist roles ("travelers"), see Kaplan, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

ments are still made through a tourist agency. His excursions do not bring him much further afield than do those of the organized mass tourist. He, too, does his experiencing from within the "environmental bubble" of his home country and ventures out of it only occasionally—and even then only into well-charted territory. Familiarity is still dominant, but somewhat less so than in the preceding type; the experience of novelty is somewhat greater, though it is often of the routine kind.

The explorer. This type of tourist arranges his trip alone; he tries to get off the beaten track as much as possible, but he nevertheless looks for comfortable accommodations and reliable means of transportation. He tries to associate with the people he visits and to speak their language. The explorer dares to leave his "environmental bubble" much more than the previous two types, but he is still careful to be able to step back into it when the going becomes too rough. Though novelty dominates, the tourist does not immerse himself completely in his host society, but retains some of the basic routines and comforts of his native way of life.

The drifter. This type of tourist ventures furthest away from the beaten track and from the accustomed ways of life of his home country. He shuns any kind of connection with the tourist establishment, and considers the ordinary tourist experience phony. He tends to make it wholly on his own, living with the people and often taking odd-jobs to keep himself going. He tries to live the way the people he visits live, and to share their shelter, foods, and habits, keeping only the most basic and essential of his old customs. The drifter has no fixed itinerary or timetable and no well-defined goals of travel. He is almost wholly immersed in his host culture. Novelty is here at its highest, familiarity disappears almost completely.

The first two tourist types I will call *institutionalized* tourist roles; they are dealt with in a routine way by the tourist establishment—the complex of travel agencies, travel companies, hotel

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

169

chains, etc., which cater to the tourist trade. The last two types I will call *noninstitutionalized* tourist roles, in that they are open roles, at best only very loosely attached to the tourist establishment.

*The Institutionalized Forms of Tourism: The Organized and the Individual Mass Tourist*⁸

"Where were you last summer?"

"In Majorca."

"Where is that?"

"I don't know, I flew there."

(Conversation between two girls, reprinted in a German journal)

Contemporary institutionalized tourism is a mass industry. The tour is sold as a package, standardized and mass-produced.⁹ All transportation, places to be visited, sleeping and eating accommodations are fixed in advance. The tourist establishment takes complete care of the tourist from beginning to end. Still, the package tour sold by the tourist establishment purportedly offers the buyer the experience of novelty and strangeness. The problem of the system, then, is to enable the mass tourist to "take in" the novelty of the host country without experiencing any physical discomfort or, more accurately, to observe without actually experiencing.

Since the tourist industry serves large numbers of people, these have to be processed as efficiently, smoothly, and quickly as possible through all the phases of their tour. Hence, it is imperative that the experience of the tourist, however novel it might seem to him, be as ordered, predictable, and controllable as possible. In short, he has to be given the illusion of adventure, while all the risks and uncertainties of adventure are taken out of his tour. In this respect, the quality of the mass tourist's experiences approaches that of vicarious participation in other people's lives,

⁸ For a general description of the trends characteristic of modern mass tourism, see Knebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 99ff.

⁹ See Boorstin, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

similar to the reading of fiction or the viewing of motion pictures. The tourist establishment achieves this effect through two inter-related mechanisms that I will call the *transformation of attractions* and the *standardization of facilities*.

Every country, region, or locality has something which sets it apart from all others, something for which it is known and worth visiting: scenic beauty, architecture, feasts or festivals, works of art, etc. In German there is a very appropriate term for these features, *Sehenswürdigkeiten*, or “things worth seeing,” and I will call them “attractions.” Some attractions are of world renown, and become the trademark of a place; these attract tourists naturally. In other cases, they are created artificially—they are contrived “tourist attractions.”¹⁰

The main purpose of mass tourism is the visiting of attractions, whether genuine or contrived. However, even if they are genuine, the tendency is to transform or manipulate them, to make them “suitable” for mass tourist consumption. They are supplied with facilities, reconstructed, landscaped, cleansed of unsuitable elements, staged, managed, and otherwise organized. As a result, they largely lose their original flavor and appearance and become isolated from the ordinary flow of life and natural texture of the host society.¹¹ Hawaiian dancing girls have to be dressed for public decency—but not too much, so that they remain attractive; natural sights have to be groomed and guarded until they look like well-kept parks; traditional festivals have to be made more colorful and more respectable so tourists will be attracted but not offended. Festivals and ceremonies, in particular, cease being spontaneous expressions of popular feelings and become well-staged spectacles.¹² Even still-inhabited old quarters of otherwise modern cities are often turned into “living

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

¹¹ In Boorstin's language, they become “pseudo-events.”

¹² “Not only in Mexico City and Montreal, but also in the remote Guatemalan Tourist Mecca of Chichicastenango, out in far-off villages of Japan, earnest honest natives embellish their ancient rites, change, enlarge and spectacularize their festivals, so that tourists will not be disappointed.” *Ibid.*, p. 103.

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

171

museums" to attract tourists, like the old town of Acre in Israel, Old San Juan, and Old Town in Chicago.

While the transformation of attractions provides controlled novelty for the mass tourist, the standardization of facilities serves to provide him with the necessary familiarity in his immediate surroundings. The majority of tourists originate today from the affluent Western countries, the U. S. and Western Europe, and increasingly from Japan. Hence, whatever country aspires to attract mass tourism is forced to provide facilities on a level commensurate with the expectations of the tourists from those countries. A tourist infrastructure of facilities based on Western standards has to be created even in the poorest host countries. This tourist infrastructure provides the mass tourist with the protective "ecological bubble" of his accustomed environment. However, since the tourist also expects some local flavor or signs of foreignness in his environment, there are local decorations in his hotel room, local foods in the restaurants, local products in the tourist shops. Still, even these are often standardized: the decorations are made to resemble the standard image of that culture's art, the local foods are made more palatable to unaccustomed tongues, the selection of native crafts is determined by the demands of the tourist.¹³

The transformation of attractions and the standardization of facilities, made necessary by the difficulties of managing and satisfying large numbers of tourists, have introduced a basic uniformity or similarity into the tourist experience. Whole countries lose their individuality to the mass tourist as the richness of their culture and geography is reduced by the tourist industry to a few standard elements, according to which they are classified and presented to the mass tourist. Before he even begins his tour, he is conditioned to pay attention primarily to the few basic attractions and facilities advertised in the travel literature or suggested by

¹³ Boorstin, talking of the Hilton chain of hotels, states: "Even the measured admixture of carefully filtered local atmosphere [in these hotels] proves that you are still in the U.S." *Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.

the travel agent, which are catalogued and sometimes even assigned a level of "importance."¹⁴ This induces a peculiar kind of selective awareness: the tourist tends to become aware of his environment only when he reaches spots of "interest," while he is largely oblivious to it the rest of the time.¹⁵ As a result, countries become interchangeable in the tourist's mind. Whether he is looking for good beaches, restful forests, or old cities, it becomes relatively unimportant to him where these happen to be found. Transportation by air, which brings him almost directly to his destination without his having to pass through other parts of the host country, contributes to the isolation of the attractions and facilities from the rest of the country—as well as the isolation of the tourist. And so mass tourism has created the following paradox: though the desire for variety, novelty, and strangeness are the primary motives of tourism, these qualities have decreased as tourism has become institutionalized.

In popular tourist countries, the tourist system or infrastructure has become separated from the rest of the culture and the natural flow of life. Attractions and facilities which were previously frequented by the local population are gradually abandoned. As Greenwich Village became a tourist attraction, many of the original bohemians moved to the East Village. Even sites of high symbolic value for the host society may suffer a similar fate: houses of government, churches, and national monuments become more and more the preserve of the mass tourist and are less and less frequented by the native citizen.

¹⁴ For an analysis of the travel literature, see Knebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 90–97. On the development of the guidebook, particularly the Baedeker, see Boorstin, *op. cit.*, pp. 109ff., and Knebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 24–26.

¹⁵ The tendency of the mass tourist to abide by the guidebook was noticed a hundred years ago by "A Cynic" who wrote in 1869: "The ordinary tourist has no judgment; he admires what the infallible Murray orders him to admire The tourist never diverges one hair's breadth from the beaten track of his predecessors, and within a few miles of the best known routes in Europe leaves nooks and corners as unsophisticated as they were fifty years ago; which proves that he has not sufficient interest in his route to exert his own freedom of will." "A Cynic: Vacations," *Cornhill Magazine*, August 1869, reported in *Mass Leisure*, E. Larrabee and K. Meyersohn (eds.), (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952), p. 285.

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

173

The ecological differentiation of the tourist sphere from the rest of the country makes for social separation; the mass tourist travels in a world of his own, surrounded by, but not integrated in, the host society. He meets the representatives of the tourist establishment—hotel managers, tourist agents, guides—but only seldom the natives.¹⁶ The natives, in turn, see the mass tourist as unreal. Neither has much of an opportunity to become an individual to the other.

A development complementary to the ecological differentiation of the tourist sphere is the gradual emergence of an international tourist system, reaching across political and cultural boundaries. The system enjoys a certain independence and even isolation from its immediate surroundings, and an internal homogeneity in spite of the wide variations between the countries with which it intersects. The autonomy and isolation can be most clearly seen in those cases where tourists enjoy some special facilities that are out of bounds to the members of the host society, such as spas and nightclubs in Eastern European countries serving exclusively foreigners or the Berionka (dollar shop) in the Soviet Union, which caters only to tourists.

The isolation of the mass tourist from the host society is further intensified by a general communication gap. Tourist publications and travel literature are ordinarily written in the spirit of the tourist establishment—and often not by a native of the country—whose prime motive is selling, not merely informing. Such literature colors the tourist's attitudes and expectations beforehand. But probably more responsible than any other single factor mentioned thus far in creating and maintaining the isolation of the tourist is the fact that he seldom knows the language of the country he is traveling in. Not knowing the language makes forming acquaintances with natives and traveling about on one's own so difficult that few tourists attempt it to any extent. Even worse, it leaves the tourist without any real feel for the culture or people of the country.

¹⁶ Boorstin, *op. cit.*, pp. 91ff.; Knebel, *op. cit.*, pp. 102–104; see also Knebel's discussion of the primary tourist group, *op. cit.* pp., 104–106.

The sad irony of modern institutionalized tourism is that, instead of destroying myths between countries, it perpetrates them. The tourist comes home with the illusion that he has "been" there and can speak with some authority about the country he has visited. I would hypothesize that the larger the flow of mass tourists becomes, the more institutionalized and standardized tourism becomes and consequently the stronger the barriers between the tourist and the life of the host country become. What were previously formal barriers *between* different countries become informal barriers *within* countries.

*The Noninstitutionalized Forms of Tourism:
The Explorer and the Drifter*

Boorstin's vivid description of the evolution of the aristocratic traveler of yesterday into the tourist of modern times oversimplifies the issue to make a point. For Boorstin, there exists either the mass tourist or the adventurer, who contrives crazy feats and fabricates risks in order to experience excitement.¹⁷ Even Knebel's less tendentious analysis postulates little variety in the role structure of the contemporary tourist. Both writers seem to have overlooked the noninstitutionalized tourist roles of explorer and drifter.

While the roles of both the explorer and the drifter are non-institutionalized, they differ from each other chiefly in the extent to which they venture out of their microenvironment and away from the tourist system, and in their attitudes toward the people and countries they visit.

The explorer tries to avoid the mass tourist route and the traditional tourist attraction spots, but he nevertheless looks for comfortable accommodations and reliable means of transportation. He ventures into areas relatively unknown to the mass tourist and explores them for his own pleasure. The explorer's

¹⁷ Boorstin, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-117.

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

175

experience of the host country, its people, places, and culture, is unquestionably much broader and deeper than that of the mass tourist. He tries to associate with the people he visits and to speak their language, but he still does not wholly immerse himself in the host society. He remains somewhat detached, either viewing his surroundings from an aesthetic perspective or seeking to understand the people on an intellectual level. Unlike the drifter, he does not identify with the natives emotionally or try to become one of them during his stay.

Through his mode of travel, the explorer escapes the isolation and artificiality the tourist system imposes on the mass tourist. Paradoxically, though, in his very attempts at escape he serves as a spearhead of mass tourism; as he discovers new places of interest, he opens the way for more commercialized forms of tourism, the managers of which are always on the lookout for new and unusual attractions. His experiences and opinions serve as indicators to other, less adventurous tourists to move into the area. As more and more of these move in, the tourist establishment gradually takes over. Thus, partly through the unwitting help of the explorer, the scope of the system expands.

As the tourist system expands, fewer and fewer areas are left that have mass tourist potential in terms of the traditional kinds of attractions. Recently, however, the ability of an area to offer a degree of privacy and solitude has, in itself, become a commodity of high value. Indeed, much of the mass tourist business today seems to be oriented to the provision of privacy *per se*. Obviously, mass tourism here reaches a point at which success is self-defeating.

While the explorer is the contemporary counterpart of the traveler of former years, the drifter is more like the wanderer of previous times. The correspondence is not complete, though. In his attitude toward and mode of traveling, the drifter is a genuine modern phenomenon. He is often a child of affluence, who reacts against it. He is young, often a student or a graduate, who has not yet started to work. He prolongs his moratorium

by moving around the world in search of new experiences, radically different from those he has been accustomed to in his sheltered middle-class existence. After he has savored these experiences for a time, he usually settles down to an orderly middle-class career.

The drifter seeks the excitement of complete strangeness and direct contact with new and different people. He looks for experiences, happenings, and kicks. His mode of travel is adopted to this purpose. In order to preserve the freshness and spontaneity of his experience, the drifter purposely travels without either itinerary or timetable, without a destination or even well-defined purpose. He often possesses only limited means for traveling, but even when this is not true, he usually is concerned with making his money last as long as possible so as to prolong his travels. Since he is also typically unconcerned with bodily comfort and desires to live as simply as possible while traveling, he will travel, eat, and sleep in the most inexpensive way possible. He moves about on bicycle or motorcycle or hitchhikes rides in autos, private planes, freighters, and fishing boats. He shares rooms with fellow travelers he has met along the way or stays with a native of the area who has befriended him. When necessary, and often when not, he will sleep outdoors. And he will cook his own meals outdoors or buy food on the street more often than eat in a restaurant. If, in spite of such frugality, his money runs out before his desire to travel does, he will work at almost any odd-job he can get until he has enough to move on.

The particular way of life and travel of the drifter brings him into contact with a wide variety of people; these usually belong to the lower social groups in the host society. Often the drifter associates with kindred souls in the host society. In my study of a mixed Jewish-Arab town in Israel, I encountered a great deal of association between drifters and local Arab boys who also wanted to travel.¹⁸

¹⁸ E. Cohen, "Arab Boys and Tourist Girls in a Mixed Jewish-Arab Community." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (1971), pp. 217-233.

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

177

An international subculture of drifters seems to be developing. In some places drifters congregate and create an ecological niche of their own. On the shore of the Red Sea in Eilat, Israel's southernmost port, there is a "permanently temporary" colony of squatters locally called "beatniks," who drifted there from many parts of the world. Similarly, the National Monument on the Dam, in the very center of Amsterdam, serves as a mass meeting place for young people who flock there from all over Europe and the U.S.

The drifter discards almost completely the familiar environment of his home country and immerses himself in the life of the host society. Moreover, as explained above, the drifter differs significantly from the explorer in the manner in which he relates to the host society. The drifter is, then, the true rebel of the tourist establishment and the complete opposite of the mass tourist.

Discussion

So far I have formulated a general approach to the sociology of tourism based on a typology of tourist roles. Here I will develop some implications of this approach and propose several problems for further research.

The fundamental variable that forms the basis for the fourfold typology of tourist roles proposed here is strangeness versus familiarity. Each of the four tourist roles discussed represents a characteristic form of tourist behavior and a typical position on the strangeness/familiarity continuum. The degree to which strangeness or familiarity prevail in the tourist role determines the nature of the tourist's experiences as well as the effect he has on the host society.

Initially, all tourists are strangers in the host society. The degree to which and the way they affect each other depends largely on the *extent* and *variety* of social contacts the tourist has during his trip. The social contacts of the mass tourist, particularly of

the organized mass tourist, are extremely limited. The individual mass tourist, being somewhat more independent, makes occasional social contacts, but his conventional mode of travel tends to restrict them to the close periphery of the tourist establishment, thus limiting their number and their nature. The social contacts of the explorer are broader and more varied, while those of the drifter are the most intensive in quality and the most extensive in quantity.

The extent to which the tourist role is predefined and the social expectations of it spelled out determines to a large degree the *manner* in which tourists interact with members of the host society, as well as the images they develop of one another. The mass tourist generally does not interact at all, but merely observes, and even that from within his own microenvironment. The explorer mixes but does not become involved. The drifter, however, often becomes both physically and emotionally involved in the lives of members of the host society. Here the length of *time* spent in one place is as important a determinant of social involvement as attitude. The drifter, unlike the mass tourist, does not set a limit beforehand on the length of time he will spend in any one place; if he finds an area that particularly pleases him, he may stop there long enough for social involvement to occur.

Tourism has some important aggregate effects on the host society, in terms of its impact on the division of labor and on the ecology or the land-use patterns of that society. As the tourist role becomes institutionalized, a whole set of other roles and institutions develop in the host country to cater to his needs—what we have called the tourist establishment. This development gradually introduces a new dimension into the ecology of the host society, as attractions and facilities are created, improved, and set aside for tourist use. This primary impact of tourism has important secondary and tertiary consequences.¹⁹ Predominantly

¹⁹ For some of these see J. Forster, "The Sociological Consequences of Tourism," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (1964), pp. 217–227.

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

179

agricultural regions may become primarily tourist areas, as agriculture is driven out by tourist facilities, and the local people turn to tourist services for their living. The "tourist villages" in the Austrian Alps are an example. Conversely, stagnant agricultural areas may receive a boost from increased demand for agricultural products in nearby tourist regions, such as the agricultural boom that has occurred in the hinterland of the Spanish Costa Brava. Without doubt, the impact of large-scale tourism on the culture, style of life, and world-view of inhabitants of tourist regions must be enormous. To my knowledge, however, the problem has not yet been systematically studied.²⁰

The explorer and the drifter do not affect the general division of labor in the host society to the same degree as the mass tourist does, and consequently do not have the same aggregate impact on that society. Their effect on the host society is more subtle, but sometimes considerable, as I found in my own study of the impact of drifting tourist girls on Arab boys in a mixed Jewish-Arab city.

It is understood that foreign travel can have a considerable impact upon the traveler himself and, through him, on his home country. In premodern times, travelers were one of the chief means through which knowledge and innovations were diffused and information about other countries obtained. How does the impact vary with the different kinds of experiences yielded by each type of tourist role, on the tourist himself, and, through him, on his own society? Is his image of and attitude toward the host country changed? Is his attitude toward his own society and his own style of life changed? In what ways? These are some of the questions that future studies of tourism might be organized around.

We also know very little about the way preferences for countries and localities are formulated in the mind of the tourist and later translated into the ways the tourist system expands or con-

²⁰ A study of this problem is in progress now in the region of Faro in southern Portugal; this is a backward region in which the sudden influx of mass tourism seems to have had some serious disruptive effects.

tracts geographically.²¹ I have dealt with the role of the explorer in the dynamics of growth of the tourist system, but other mechanisms are undoubtedly at work, such as the planned creation of new attractions to foster mass tourism, like the building of Disneyland. It might be worthwhile to differentiate between the organic and the induced growth of the tourist system and look into the differential effect of the two modes of expansion on the workings of the tourist system and the host society.

The problems raised in this paper have been dealt with in a most general form; any attempt to explore them in depth will have to make use of a comparative approach. Though tourism could be studied comparatively from several angles, the most important variables of comparison are probably the differences between the cultural characteristics of the tourist and the host²² and the manner in which tourism is embedded in the institutional structure of the host country.²³

Conclusion

Growing interaction and interpenetration between hitherto relatively independent social systems is one of the most salient characteristics of the contemporary world. In K. Deutsch's phrase, the world is rapidly becoming a "global village." No far-off island or obscure primitive tribe manages to preserve its isolation. Tourism is both a consequence of this process of interpenetration and one of several mechanisms through which this process is being realized. Its relative contribution to the process—in comparison to that of the major transforming forces of our time—is

²¹ This problem is discussed, with reference to the rather special conditions of Hawaii and other Pacific islands, by Forster, *op. cit.*

²² W. A. Sutton, "Travel and Understanding: Notes on the Social Structure of Touring," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (1967), pp. 218–223, touches upon this point in a discussion of factors which make for harmony and tension in the tourist-host encounter.

²³ Forster's argument about the differential impact of tourism on a society with an underdeveloped as against an advanced economy is one example of such an approach. Another would be to compare the effects of tourism on closed (totalitarian) as against open (democratic) societies.

SOCIOLOGY OF TOURISM

181

probably minor, though it seems to be increasing rapidly. Tourism already serves as the chief source of foreign currency in several countries, and its scope is growing at an accelerating rate.

It is interesting to speculate, then, about some of the broader sociological consequences of the increase in the scope of tourism for the society of the future. The picture which emerges is complex. On the one hand, as the number of mass tourists grows, the tourist industry will become more and more mechanized and standardized. This, in turn, will tend to make the interaction between tourist and host ever more routinized. The effect of the host country on the mass tourist will therefore remain limited, whereas his effect on the ecology, division of labor, and wealth of the country will grow as his numbers do. On the other hand, as host societies become permeated by a wide variety of individually traveling tourists belonging to different classes and ways of life, increased and more varied social contacts will take place, with mixed results for international understanding.²⁴ Like-minded persons of different countries will find it easier to communicate with each other and some kind of new international social groupings might appear. Among the very rich such groups always existed; the fashionable contemporary prototype is the international "jet-set." And only recently drifter communities have emerged in many parts of the world, comprised of an entirely different kind of social category. The effect of such developments may well be to diminish the significance of national boundaries, though they may also create new and sometimes serious divisions within the countries in which such international groups congregate. Some indication of the emergence of new foci of conflict can already be seen in the recent riots between drifters and seamen in Amsterdam, the hub of the European "drifter community."

Finally, the differential impact of tourism on various types of societies should be noted. As Forster pointed out,²⁵ the impact

²⁴ See Sutton, *op. cit.*

²⁵ See Forster, *op. cit.*

of tourism on a society with an unbalanced, developing economy might be much more serious than its impact on a mature, well-developed society. As tourism is eagerly sought for by the developing nations as an important source of revenue, it may provoke serious disruptions and cause ultimate long-range damage in these societies. The consequences cannot yet be fully foreseen, but from what we already know of the impact of mass tourism it can safely be predicted that mass tourism in developing countries, if not controlled and regulated, might help to destroy whatever there is still left of unspoiled nature and of traditional ways of life. In this respect, the easy-going tourist of our era might well complete the work of his predecessors, also travelers from the West—the conqueror and the colonialist.