



BEHAVIORAL CONCEPTUALIZATION OF TOURISM AND LEISURE

Kevin Moore
Grant Cushman
David Simmons

Lincoln University, New Zealand

Abstract: Understanding the conceptual relationships between tourism and leisure is important, particularly if tourism is considered a "special" form of leisure. The paper begins with behavioral conceptualizations of tourism and leisure, followed by a comparative behavioral analysis of tourism and leisure, then an examination of social theoretical accounts of the two fields. It argues that tourism is not a special form of leisure and that differences in social theoretical analyses of tourism and leisure might result from different research ideologies. Finally, the article concludes with the presentation of a behavioral synthesis of the two fields, along with identification of areas for future research. **Keywords:** conceptualizations, leisure, tourism, behavioral analysis, social theoretical analysis, everyday life.

Résumé: La conceptualisation du comportement du tourisme et des loisirs. Il est important de comprendre les rapports conceptuels entre le tourisme et les loisirs, surtout si on considère le tourisme comme une sorte de loisir "spécial". L'article commence par des conceptualisations behavioristes du tourisme et des loisirs, suivies d'une analyse behavioriste comparative du tourisme et des loisirs et un examen des explications théoriques sociales des deux domaines. On soutient que le tourisme n'est pas une sorte de loisir spécial et que les différences entre les analyses théoriques sociales du tourisme et des loisirs pourraient résulter des différentes idéologies de recherche. L'article conclut par la présentation d'une synthèse behavioriste des deux domaines avec l'identification des domaines pour de nouvelles recherches. **Mots-clés:** conceptualisations, loisirs, tourisme, analyse behavioriste, analyse théorique sociale, vie quotidienne.

INTRODUCTION

In the literature examining the conceptualizations of tourism and leisure, the relationships that exist between the two fields have come under increasing scrutiny (Bodewes 1981; Hamilton-Smith 1987; Jafari and Ritchie 1981; Leiper 1990a; Mannell and Iso-Ahola 1987; Mieczkowski 1981). Some of these authors have argued that tourism is a special form of leisure, having its own special characteristics (Leiper 1990a), while other research has suggested that particular types or kinds of tourism can be distinguished based on leisure attributes (Ham-

Authors are all members of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, Lincoln University (Canterbury, New Zealand. E-mail "moore@lincoln.ac.nz). **Kevin Moore**, Lecturer, has research interests in tourist behavior, leisure theory, and the philosophy of psychology and science. **Grant Cushman**, Professor and Head, researches in leisure and public/social policy, leisure participation, urban studies, and urban leisure management. **David Simmons**, Senior Lecturer, researches in social impact assessment, tourism policy, and development.

ilton-Smith 1987). In the light of this research, Crick's (1989:313) comment that taxonomies of tourists and tourism "separate phenomena that are clearly fuzzy or overlapping" could easily be applied to the interface between leisure and tourism studies in general. That is, the fields of leisure and tourism are "clearly fuzzy or overlapping" and creating taxonomies that separate the two is not only a difficult task but it may also obscure their similarities. Clarifying this overlap and "fuzziness" has been the aim of much of the research already mentioned.

Overlaps between tourism and leisure exist at several levels as noted by Fedler (1987). As the guest editor of a special issue of the *Annals of Tourism Research* on the relationships between leisure, recreation and tourism he commented:

Several common threads, beside the phenomena, link each of the papers together. Clearly the same tool or tools from an assortment of academic disciplines (e.g., psychology, sociology, geography) can be applied to the study of the phenomena. Motivation, perception, relationships and theoretical orientations can be applied to leisure, recreation, and tourism to better understand [sic] the function, form, and process involved in each type of behavior" (1987:311).

Yet, despite this current interest in the relationships between leisure and tourism, as areas of research they have developed in relative isolation. For example, Smith and Godbey (1991) commented that while there is evidence that attitudes are changing, the "traditions of recreation and leisure studies have historically ignored tourism" (1991:93). The same comment could justifiably be made in the opposite direction, at least until recently. As an example of this lack of contact, Smith and Godbey (1991) noted that van Raaij and Francken's (1984) notion of a "vacation sequence" is very similar to the five-phase account of the recreation process developed by Clawson and Knetsch (1966) and yet seems to have been developed in isolation. However, Fridgen (1984) adopted the Clawson and Knetsch model in his attempt to outline the potential and actual contributions of environmental psychology to tourism research. This suggests that what conceptual contact there is between the two areas may be unsystematic and individualistic. This in turn highlights the need for better theoretical constructs if conceptual synthesis or merging is to be achieved.

At the same time, as unsystematic and spontaneous attempts are being made to explore the conceptual relationships between tourism and leisure, controversies remain over fundamental definitional and philosophical issues in both areas of study. The nature of leisure including concerns over subjective definitions of "perceived freedom" in leisure, definitions of "tourist" and "tourism" and the status of tourism as an industry are all unresolved matters central to the conceptualization process in the respective fields of study. It may, therefore, seem premature to be discussing the relationships between tourism and leisure when the separate fields have not yet been clearly defined. However, this caution fails to acknowledge that science, and social science in particular, is often in a dynamic state with the presence of competing theories and definitions being the norm rather than the exception. The

“single unifying theory” is a rarely held proposition, at least in the social sciences. Furthermore, work in the philosophy of science that undermines belief in an unequivocal rational basis for science would suggest that the search for a final general theory is best seen as a guiding heuristic or “horizon” concept rather than an achievable goal (Feyerabend 1975; Kuhn 1970). It is possible that far from compounding any confusion or uncertainty, examining the relationships between leisure and tourism may be one fruitful way of aiding the process of conceptual clarification within the two areas.

This paper examines behavioral aspects of the conceptual relationships that exist between leisure and tourism. In particular, attention will be focused on the proposition that tourism might warrant “special status” within a leisure context (Leiper 1990a). Since the discussion is limited largely to behavioral aspects of the relationships, this paper cannot be seen as a comprehensive attempt to compare the entire multidisciplinary fields. Some of the points made in the following discussion may not, therefore, apply to other aspects of the relationships. However, focusing on the behaviors that form the two phenomena seems an appropriate starting point for a comprehensive examination. This paper will also attempt to explore some of the broader social relationships between the two fields of study. For example, to what extent have the current conceptualizations of tourism and leisure been determined by the social and cultural histories within which they have arisen as opposed to the “nature” of the two phenomena? The answer to this question may go some way toward explaining why tourism and leisure appear as separate fields of study. It may also reveal commonalities between leisure and tourism that have been previously overlooked simply by virtue of the different contexts in which the research has evolved.

LEISURE AND TOURISM

Behavioral Conceptualization

As already mentioned, the range of disciplinary perspectives used to conceptualize the two areas is broad and beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, the focus here will be on behavioral and industry conceptualizations. The emphasis is on outlining some of the significant and important ideas involved in understanding leisure and tourism and the relationships between them, followed by a more detailed comparison of their social theoretical treatments.

Reid, McLellan and Uysal (1993) identified five different concepts of leisure in the academic literature. The first involves a work/non-work dichotomy with leisure being free, residual time during which people have discretion over what they do. This view is in the tradition of Dumazdier (1960) and Kaplan (1960). The second is an Aristotelian view which sees leisure as a state of being and places value on contemplative pursuits (deGrazia 1964; Pieper 1952). The third concept links reformist and therapeutic themes and emphasises leisure as a chance to meet the needs of disadvantaged groups. The fourth includes views of leisure as a state of mind which is of value in itself and involves express-

ing the self to attain pleasure. Finally, Reid et al (1993) suggested that there is a holistic approach which synthesizes the previous concepts that conceives of leisure as a multidimensional construct embracing a range of self-determined activities and experiences. Whether this approach represents a successful synthesis or simply the acknowledgement that some synthesis is necessary could be debated.

A conceptual strand that threads through the above conceptualizations and the leisure and recreation literature in general is the concept of "freedom." It can be found in the various models that have been proposed as frameworks for understanding leisure. Such models can be psychological (Csikszentmihalyi 1975, 1990; Neulinger 1974, 1981), social psychological (Iso-Ahola 1980; Kelly 1983), or sociological (Clarke and Critcher 1985; Kelly 1987; Roberts 1981) in emphasis but, irrespective of disciplinary origins, will usually incorporate the notion of leisure as freedom. Close examination of the debate between those who emphasize leisure as "free time" and those who see it more as a state of mind demonstrates this point well. For example, Parker's (1983) conceptualization of leisure as something that cannot be understood in isolation from the experience of work leads to the conclusion that leisure is, in essence, freedom from work. From a political theory perspective, McCormack (1971), states that "the proper starting point for a theory of leisure is the concept of freedom" and "structural guarantees of freedom are structural guarantees of leisure" (1971:180). Also, the ideas of intrinsic motivation and perceived freedom have become important in psychologically-oriented conceptualizations of leisure as a state of mind (Csikszentmihalyi 1975, 1990; Iso-Ahola 1989; Mannell and Iso-Ahola 1987; Neulinger 1974). Taken together, these two concepts emphasize leisure as based on the awareness of freedom in carrying out an activity—highly subjective yet potentially highly rewarding.

However, Goodale has suggested that an emphasis on the perception rather than the reality of freedom is a psychologistic obfuscation of the social conditions that underlie leisure. He suggests that this emphasis may in fact be antithetical to leisure and argues that because of this, leisure researchers "have abandoned freedom itself" (1990:299). Nevertheless, it is important to note that Goodale (1990) still acknowledges the need for retaining the notion of "real" freedom in the conceptualization of leisure.

Leisure has also been discussed in relation to many aspects of life. For example, Rapoport and Rapoport (1975) have mapped changes in leisure over the family life cycle, while researchers such as Henderson (1990a) have examined the gender-leisure nexus. The important work of Kelly (1990) deserves brief mention here as an attempt to characterize the multidimensional nature of leisure. His contribution includes dividing leisure into a leisure "core," which involves relatively accessible, low cost, low effort, and often home-based activities that people do a lot, and a "balance" to this core, which includes activities such as sport and tourism that require significant effort and are sensitive to resource difficulties such as education and income. Kelly (1983) also emphasizes the intensity of the leisure experience seeing it as being dependent upon the two orthogonally related dimensions of "levels of

activity" (from time-filling to flow) and "social interaction" (from solitary to communion). Furthermore, he has suggested a "social-existential" model in which leisure is understood by reference both to the social forces that influence human behavior and to the decisions made by individuals who perceive that they have some freedom to make choices (Kelly 1987).

Conceptualizations of tourism are as varied as those of leisure. In fact, Smith (1989) states that tourism "does not have a real, objective, precise, and independent existence," but is "to a significant degree, whatever we decide it will be" (1989:31). This mutability is partly because of the different uses to which a definition is likely to be put by people with different interests in the phenomenon of tourism. For example, Smith's (1989) concern with policy and planning means his own emphasis is on an industry definition of tourism. Elsewhere, controversy exists over whether tourism is correctly defined as an industry in its own right or simply as the result of the overlap of various other industries (Leiper 1990b, 1992; Smith 1991).

There are distinct similarities in the literature between some conceptualizations of the tourist industry and the leisure industry. For example, Brown and Veal state that the leisure industry "encompasses those organizations and individuals primarily involved in the provision of goods, services and facilities to individuals or groups in their leisure time" (1988:7). Meanwhile, Smith describes the tourism industry as "the aggregate of all businesses that directly provide goods or services to facilitate business, pleasure and leisure activities away from the home environment" (1988:181).

Tourism has also been defined as "the set of ideas, the theories or ideologies, for being a tourist, and it is the behaviour of people in touristic roles when the ideas are put into practice" (Leiper 1990a:17). In a similar vein, Simmons and Leiper (1993:205) simply conclude that "[t]ourism is the behaviour of tourists" after noting the various definitions and understandings of tourism in the literature.

Recent analyses emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of tourism and suggest the use of system models to help with its conceptualization (Leiper 1979, 1990a; Mill and Morrison 1985; Nash 1992; Simmons and Leiper 1993). These approaches are often based on a geographic depiction of tourism that emphasizes the tourist traveling from a "generating region" to a "destination area" via "transit routes."

Such interdisciplinary and systems-oriented understandings have been developed from what Jafari (1990) has called the Knowledge-based Platform or approach to the study of tourism. He differentiates four fundamental positions taken by researchers. The Advocacy Platform, as the name suggests, is that adopted by those writers generally in favor of tourism and who tend to emphasize its economic benefits and, to a lesser extent, the rôle of tourism in preserving natural and built environments and cultural practices and performances. The Cautionary Platform emerged as a reaction to unrestrained advocacy, and attempts to highlight the negative consequences that sometimes result from tourism development. The Adaptancy Platform arose from the belief that some forms of tourism have fewer impacts than others. Proponents of this platform tend to favor types of tourism "which are

responsive to the host communities and their sociocultural, man-made [sic], and natural environments, and at the same time provide tourists with new choices and rewarding experiences" (Jafari 1990:35). Finally, the Knowledge-based Platform grew from the realization that the other platforms represented only partial accounts of tourism. This attempts to examine the whole of tourism from a scientific and inclusive viewpoint.

The acknowledgement of the interdisciplinary nature of tourism studies parallels the frequent calls for multidisciplinary, if not interdisciplinary (Jafari and Ritchie 1981), in recreation and leisure research (Burdge and Beckers 1984; Burton and Jackson 1989; Coppock 1982). This indicates that conceptualizations of both leisure and tourism are thought to require the integration of a large number of perspectives into a highly complex framework.

Behavioral Analyses

Most commentators who have examined the relationships between leisure and tourism acknowledge that a large amount of common ground can be found at the level of individual behavior (Fedler 1987). This is particularly evident in any analysis of what is often called the demand side of the phenomena.

Much research into tourism has been concerned with identifying those socioeconomic factors that influence tourist demand. Analysis of these factors, including those that influence demand for other forms of leisure, provides insight into the tourism-leisure relationship and particularly the justification, or otherwise, of regarding tourism as a special category of leisure.

Demand for travel has often been analyzed in terms of two sets of factors; travel facilitators that *enable* a person to travel, and travel motivators that help explain *why* those people who are able to travel actually choose to do so (Collier 1991). In research terms, travel facilitators generally relate to the disciplines of economics and sociology, and can be thought of as extrinsic or external factors indicative of the broad trends in the pattern of demand for travel at the macro level. Travel motivators, in contrast, tend to relate to the discipline of psychology and can be thought of as intrinsic or internal factors indicative of the individual's particular travel behavior. In the tourism motivation literature, a distinction is often made between person-specific motivations and motivations related to attributes of the destination (e.g. "wanderlust" and "sunlust"). Mansfeld argues that this represents a confusion between "push motivations and pull attributes and images of a given destination" (1992:405). However, this may be a terminological dispute since incentive theories of motivation in the psychological literature are still termed "motivational" theories despite the fact that incentive is dependent upon properties of external events, especially stimuli associated with goal objectives (Hoyenga and Hoyenga 1984). Whether from changes in internal states or external stimuli, the "pleasure" (broadly defined) that results represents a motive for behavior.

In many respects this conceptualization of tourism demand in terms of facilitators and motivators has its parallel in Hamilton-Smith's

(1987) categorization of types of tourism derived from Kelly's (1987) dialectic analysis of leisure. Hamilton-Smith (1987) analyzes tourist behavior according to a structural dimension, or the external opportunities and constraints imposed upon the individual from without, and an existential dimension based on the personal experiences and valuations of the individual.

The most frequently advanced leisure-related travel facilitators used to explain tourism growth are the continuing increase in discretionary incomes for wider sections of the population in the developed countries (the major tourism generating countries) and the continuing increase in paid leisure time. A second set of facilitators include decreasing cost of air travel, in time and money (particularly through the growth of package tours). There has also been an increasing range of attractive tourism destinations made available and increased access to both formal and informal sources of information about these destinations and travel to them. Finally, political stability, peace, and free access to travel documents and accepted media of exchange have helped facilitate travel.

By way of comparison, it should be noted that participation in all forms of leisure has also been influenced by a range of external factors, which include changes in the allocation of time to work, family obligations, free time at various life stages, and discretionary income (Cushman 1986). Van Raaij and Francken's (1984) analysis of the vacation sequence acknowledges the importance of several of these factors and is an example of the commonality between analyses of leisure and travel behavior. For example, they suggest that the way in which vacation decisions are made is a function of family life-cycle stage.

Due to the dual effects of the post-war baby boom and the aging of the population, the population structure in developed countries has changed quite radically over the past two decades; and, consequently, so have trends in leisure participation. There was an overall surge in demand in the 1950s, 1960s, and into the 1970s for many types of leisure goods and services (Cushman 1989), including tourism. More recently, such changes as the energy crisis, technological change, growing structural unemployment, and a slowdown in population increase have forced leisure and tourism managers to rethink the basic assumption of unrestrained growth and expansion in all facets of leisure.

Increasingly, there has been competition between service providers for the leisure money, with there being little evidence over time to suggest increasing preference for any one major form of leisure over others. The task of distinguishing changing leisure preferences or relative actual growth or decline in participation in different forms of leisure is difficult as each of the leisure sectors (e.g., tourism, arts, entertainment, sport) applies operational definitions that are extremely broad, overlapping, and inclusive. The possibility of a range of leisure activities being simultaneously categorized as entertainment, tourism, and artistic, for example, may result in exaggerated participation and demand statistics.

Changes in leisure demand and participation are, therefore, complex and it is not possible to draw firm conclusions about the relative magnitude and significance of various forms of leisure. Even more

difficult is to establish the relative importance of external factors affecting leisure participation because of "interaction effects" between factors and associated measurement problems (Mercer 1977). It is also difficult to ascertain what proportion of the expansion in various leisure activities and the expenditure on leisure goods is due to the effects of population variables, on the one hand, and the "faddishness" of leisure trends, including changing tastes and preferences, on the other. Nor is it well understood how much of the potential demand for various forms of leisure will be translated into actual demand (Cushman 1983).

All of this suggests that at least the major facilitators of travel are the same as those factors responsible for patterns of participation in other forms of leisure to a greater or lesser degree. At the behavioral level, then, there is room for the investigation of common social, economic, and political factors that may effect all forms of leisure behavior, including tourism.

When examining the relationships between the various motivating factors applicable to both leisure and tourism, Leiper's (1990a) distinction between touristic leisure and all other forms of leisure becomes important. He argues that for many people tourism represents an especially valued category of leisure because of a combination of attributes that set it apart in important ways from other leisure activities and experiences. Leiper (1990a) comments that research analyzing the diverse needs and motivations of tourists is not very useful in establishing the distinctiveness of tourist behavior, since these studies (Crompton 1979; Dann 1977) present a range of motivating factors associated with tourism that are equally relevant to other forms of leisure. These include motivations such as needs for relaxation, to be with friends, to have fun or pleasure, to experience a different setting, and to have novel experiences. Many of these needs can be satisfied in leisure experiences in or close to the home. To identify anything distinctive about tourist motivations and needs, Leiper (1990a) compares touristic leisure with other leisure in terms of seven factors. First, the nature of withdrawal and return, which in tourism involves a major physical withdrawal away from one's usual place of residence, allowing for a greater sense of freedom and multidimensional change than may be possible in other forms of leisure. Second, the duration of travel is often greater than in other forms of leisure, occurring as it does in relatively large blocks of time. Third, travel also tends to occur less frequently than with other leisure which, according to Leiper, often makes it more vividly anticipated, savored and remembered. Fourth, tourism offers people a wider variety of opportunities for socializing than is available in other leisure. Fifth, travel costs more than other leisure, which both constrain demand and may add value to it for tourists. Sixth, travel is more exclusive than other forms of leisure since, at any one time, relatively few people out of a population will be away and in any one year few members of a community will have traveled to another country. Finally, tourism, Leiper suggests, is seen as relatively discrete by most people in that trips will tend to stand out in a person's memory in a way that other leisure experiences do not.

While this approach has considerable merit, certain difficulties arise from it as a consequence. The grouping of other leisure into a single

homogeneous category assumes that all leisure forms, apart from tourism, have undifferentiated attributes, which is not the case. Various forms of leisure differ in terms of the attributes mentioned by Leiper (1990a) and possess attributes that distinguish them from other forms of leisure, including tourism. For example, organized sport differs from most other leisure in having a highly structured set of rules that delimit and (to a certain extent) determine the behaviors expressed, provide instantaneous feedback, and clearly demarcate success and failure. This may promote "flow" as discussed by Csikszentmihalyi (1975, 1990) in a way that other forms of leisure do not and, therefore, lead to a "unique" and "special" experience of sport as leisure. Many other attributes of different forms of leisure could be chosen for use as examples here, but the point is simply that all forms of leisure are obviously distinct in some way from all other forms. There is, therefore, nothing particularly "special" about tourism's "specialness."

Furthermore, a number of studies indicate that reasons for leisure participation, and the needs satisfied by this participation, vary according to leisure forms and activity groups. For example, Jackson (1982), in analyzing the leisure activity patterns of Albertans, found considerable variation in dimensions measuring reasons for participating in creative-cultural activities, outdoor activities, physical activities, and social activities. A "challenge" dimension was strongly related to preferences for creative-cultural and physical activities, but was much less important to social activities. Preference for physical and social activities was related to a "socialization" dimension of reasons for participating, and much less so to creative-cultural activities and outdoor activities. The need for "relaxation" was related to preferences for creative-cultural and outdoor activities, and much less so to physical and social activities. This research supports the conclusion that there is considerable variation in motivations and needs between groups of people involved in different forms of leisure. Thus, the assumption that all of these leisure forms serve the same needs and motivations is mistaken. If this assumption underlies Leiper's (1990a) attempt to differentiate tourism from other leisure, then the attempt may need revising in various ways. For example, tourist motivations may in fact differentiate tourism from other forms of leisure (contra Leiper's claim), just as motivations distinguished between other forms of leisure in Jackson's (1982) study. That is, while any particular motive may be shared by some of the participants in two different forms of leisure activity, the particular complex of motives involved in any activity may be "unique" to that activity. This does not necessarily mean that there is no possibility of substitution between leisure forms in the economist's sense of the term. Identical motivational profiles for an activity should not be necessary for substitution. All that may be required is similarity between motivational complexes for different activities.

In behavioral terms, then, there seems little necessity to insist on a major distinction between tourism and leisure phenomena. Therefore, it should follow that a greater commonality between the research efforts in the two areas would be of advantage. Differences in the research literature can, however, still be found when the different social theoretical treatments of leisure and tourism are examined. Any conceptual-

ization of the relationships between the two areas must examine the reasons for these differences.

Social Theoretical Analyses

Social science research in the area of leisure studies has undeniably been expanding over the past two to three decades. In analyzing the contribution of the social sciences to the conceptualization and study of leisure, a convenient place to start is with the perceptions of active researchers in the area.

Burton and Jackson (1989) carried out an extensive survey of all scholars who had ever contributed to six major leisure and recreation journals (*Journal of Leisure Research*, *Society and Leisure*, *Recreation Research Review*, *Leisure Sciences*, *Leisure Studies* and *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*). The respondents were mostly sociologists (24.5%) geographers (21.0%), and recreation and leisure studies scholars (14.7%). Economics, political science, business, and management studies scholars (12.6%), scholars in areas of interdisciplinary study (9.1%), psychologists and social psychologists (9.1%) and "Others" (9.1%) made up the rest. This is comparable to the breakdown by discipline of authors in the *Journal of Leisure Research* and *Leisure Sciences*, from inception to 1981-1982; (cited in Burton and Jackson 1989).

A notable aspect of this study is the contribution of various disciplines to the study of leisure and recreation as perceived by the respondents. The disciplines of recreation (75.5% of respondents), sociology (72.0%), psychology (58.7%), geography (42.0%), and economics (36.4%) were the disciplines most commonly perceived to be making major contributions. The four most dominant "themes" perceived by the respondents were attitudinal research (85.0% of respondents), demand analysis (84.0%), tourism research (67.0%) and carrying capacity (65.0%). Concepts and theories were thought to be a dominant theme by 39.0% of the respondents.

Social theoretical analyses of leisure are numerous and varied. This variation is largely a reflection of broader theoretical divisions within sociology. Most of the social theoretical analyses and debates concerning the conceptualization of leisure, not surprisingly, have examined the question of whether leisure is, in reality, a domain characterized by freedom. For example, neo-Marxists, or "class domination" theorists, have challenged this view of leisure. Rather than being an area of life demarcated by freedom, sociologists (Clarke and Critcher 1985; Dawson 1986, 1988; Rojek 1985, 1989) suggest that it is subject to the same processes of class domination and determination that operate on all other social activities. These researchers are concerned with emphasizing how leisure patterns and behaviors are subject to structuring by underlying and general social processes, and would consider any conceptualization of leisure as "true freedom" to be sadly misleading and even anti-theoretical (Clarke and Critcher 1985:42-43).

Similarly, feminist understandings of leisure seek to reveal the ways in which leisure, in both personal and social terms, is an expression of prevailing patriarchal tendencies and have been particularly concerned with the constraints imposed on women's leisure (Deem 1986; Harrington, Dawson and Bolla 1992; Henderson 1990a, 1990b; Henderson,

Bialeschki, Shaw and Freysinger 1989; Henderson, Stalnaker and Taylor 1988; Thompson 1981; Wearing and Wearing 1988). In fact, the whole area of constraints on leisure has been of increasing interest for researchers, partly because of the general association of leisure with freedom and the concern that leisure for some people is not as free as it "should" be (Jackson 1988, 1991).

Pluralist theories of leisure contrast markedly with these neo-marxist and feminist approaches. While acknowledging the importance of such "social networks" as the family in influencing leisure activities, the overriding determinant of leisure participation and patterns in such theories is to be found in the variety of "taste publics." These taste publics have developed different tastes for leisure due to the particular circumstances they have experienced. These tastes are essentially the attempts by individuals to create and maintain lifestyles that they value (Roberts 1981; Veal 1989). Social institutions and processes, particularly those related to class, are thought to have some influence on leisure patterns and participation, but most often not a determining influence, especially in modern western society. This debate is wide-ranging and unresolved.

The various social theoretical approaches to tourism have been reviewed by Dann and Cohen (1991). While a wide range of sociological perspectives have been used in the study of tourism, most social theoretical treatments have approached tourism from one of two directions. On the one hand, there is the work of writers such as Boorstin (1964) and Turner and Ash (1975) who employ what Dann and Cohen (1991) refer to as "conflict and critical perspectives." This perspective is one element of Jafari's (1990) Cautionary Platform. On the other hand, there are the "neo-Durkheimian" perspectives used by writers such as MacCannell (1976), Dann (1977), Graburn (1977), and Allcock (1988). The latter group depict the tourist as a modern pilgrim engaged in a modern version of the sacred quest. MacCannell (1976), for example, has suggested that sightseeing is a ritual "performed to the differentiations of society" as a means of overcoming these fragments of modern life by combining them into a unified touristic experience. Tourism becomes a quest for the "authenticity" that is lacking in the tourist's usual society. This view of tourism and the tourist is in stark contrast with that depicted by Boorstin (1964) and Turner and Ash (1975) who emphasize the exploitative and ignorant aspects of tourism and tourists, respectively.

By way of integration, Cohen (1979) has attempted to show how different tourist types may approximate to either MacCannell's or Boorstin's depictions, depending on their relationship to their own society's "center." Those who identify closely with their society's center in terms of its predominant values are more likely to partake in "recreational" travel, according to Cohen (1979), and demonstrate some of the behaviors of Boorstin's and Turner and Ash's tourists. Those with varying degrees of alienation from their society's center may partake in diversionary, experiential, experimental, or existential modes of travel and reflect more of the characteristics of MacCannell's tourists and tourism. This latter group can also be seen as part of the stimulus for the development of the Adaptancy Platform (Jafari 1990).

The idea of travel as a sacred quest and as a search for meaning has

been said to provide a common emphasis in treatments of both leisure and tourism. Smith and Godbey, for example, have suggested that both "tourism and leisure/recreation are linked to the existential quest for meaning in industrial life" (1991:94).

Nevertheless, there are distinct differences between the broad thrust of social theoretical research into tourism as opposed to leisure. To a large extent, and as already noted, social theoretical treatments of leisure have been concerned with broad social and political issues that affect participation in leisure and patterns of leisure (e.g., neo-Marxist, feminist, and pluralist analyses). Where critical and conflict perspectives have been brought to bear on tourism, the emphasis has been on the exploitative impact of tourists and tourism on "host" countries or on the manipulative machinations of tourism marketers (Hughes 1992; Uzzell 1984). Little has been done on the social processes that may affect participation and patterns of tourism, other than in a general demographic sense where the concern is largely with factors affecting demand and is market or industry driven. Exceptions do exist, of course, such as Urry's (1990) examination of the relationship between social inequalities and tourism and Haukeland's (1990) analysis of why people do not travel. Conversely, little has been done on the impacts of recreationists and people at leisure (and the accompanying industries) on the social and cultural environment, other than studies of inter-user conflicts. There has been significant research, however, on the physical and biological environmental impacts of leisure and recreation, particularly on sensitive "natural" environments.

This difference in emphasis between the social theoretical treatments of leisure and tourism may in part be due to differences in the ideological thrust of research into the two areas. It is probably true to say that research into leisure and recreation was originally motivated (and continues to be) by "welfare" concerns, broadly conceived. Preservation of urban parks and outdoor recreational areas was largely achieved through appeals to the public good and the benefits of leisure and recreation. Therapeutic recreation is founded on the assumption that access to leisure is an important component of personal welfare and adjustment.

In contrast, it is probably equally fair to say that motivations for research into tourism have been dominated by industry needs, profit, and development goals. If this were the case, then it is not surprising that social theoretical analyses have been carried out on various inequalities in leisure and recreation, but have not been emphasized in tourism research.

A further reason for different emphases in the social theoretical treatments of leisure and tourism may be found in the presence of a strong cultural motif surrounding travel. That is, the neo-Durkheimian approaches to tourism may have gained much intuitive popularity from the deep sociocultural symbols attached to the concept of travel. Pearce (1988) took inspiration for his work on the social psychology of the tourist from the ancient myth of *The Odyssey*. This inspiration is no accident, for the traveler is a dominant religious and legendary motif in many cultures. The Epic of Gilgamesh, the real and spiritual journeys of biblical figures, and the mythological navigators of the Polyne-

sian world all testify to the strength of travel as a cultural symbol, even to the extent that life itself is commonly characterized as a journey. It is possible that the prevalence of such "sacred quest" approaches to the social theoretical study of travel has as much to do with these cultural motifs as it does to the actual causes of travel.

If these admittedly speculative comments were true, it would suggest that the different emphases between social theoretical approaches to leisure and tourism do not arise because of any essential differences in the nature of tourism and leisure. Rather, they are produced by the different social, economic, and cultural influences on, and contexts of, the research efforts themselves.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the above discussion, it is possible to propose the beginnings of a behaviorally based synthesis of research into tourism and leisure. This synthesis is based on the assumption that, at least in part, the focus of research into the two areas has been influenced as much by ideological differences underlying the research as by essential differences in the phenomena. The dominance of "industry relevant" theoretical accounts of tourism may reflect the traditional ideological importance of viewing tourism as an industry, while the critical social analyses of leisure and recreation provision may similarly reflect an underlying, traditional "welfare" ideology. If this were the case, then it should be possible to reduce some current barriers to the development of an integrated synthesis of behavioral research into leisure and tourism.

It has been suggested that there is little if any need to take a dramatically different approach to the behavioral analysis of tourism and leisure. However, noting this does not, on its own, provide a general framework to study leisure and tourism in an integrated fashion. What is needed are specific suggestions as to how both sets of phenomena can be usefully analyzed so that their relationships emerge "naturally" and in the same "language."

One potential starting point for the behavioral synthesis of tourism and leisure is through conceptualizations of leisure that integrate it into the context of everyday life. Leisure inevitably develops in relation to the general social and social psychological processes that occur in life as a whole. For example, the processes that form travel preferences and decisions and leisure activities and patterns are all a part of, and are influenced by, the general processes that integrate the behavior of individuals into what has sometimes been called a lifestyle, or simply everyday life (Glyptis 1989; Olszewska and Roberts 1989). Such a holistic and systemic approach could also incorporate the concepts employed by researchers such as Veal (1989) who associates leisure with lifestyle and Rapoport and Rapoport (1975) who link leisure to the family life cycle. Rapoport and Rapoport (1975), for instance, conceptualize leisure as just one of three "planes" present in an individual's "life line." The other two are "family" and "work."

By developing such an approach, the relationships between leisure and tourism could then be clarified by progressive research into the

way in which they affect and are affected by the processes occurring along these various planes. For example, Rapoport and Rapoport state that "individuals combine [the planes] in characteristic ways to form whole life-style patterns" (1975:19). They also note that the three planes constantly interact with each other and form what they call a "triple helix" of interconnecting spirals formed by each plane. Interestingly, they also suggest that the concept of a "career" could be applied in all three planes of the life-line, such that it is possible to speak of a career in a leisure pursuit just as easily as referring to a work career. In the tourist behavior literature there is already the suggestion that a tourist can be thought of as having a "travel career" (Pearce 1988). It is possible to imagine a variety of intersecting and competing careers in constant interaction, both in the leisure plane and in the work and family planes. The task of research would be to map these various careers (including travel and other forms of leisure) and the forces behind their progression or lack of progression. Qualitative research (Rapoport and Rapoport 1975 on life histories) into specific life situations would be the most appropriate method for this task.

Such a research effort could also analyze the variety of social roles that might be played out within the same leisure activity. For example, the way in which the activity of backpacking is practiced could be seen as the result of the intersection of the leisure and family planes. Different "social lenses" could be used to examine the same activity so that in one instance a backpacker may be seen in his or her role as a parent taking children on day trips. Using another "lens," the backpacker may, in a different social context, be practicing the role of a domestic or international tourist but through the pursuit of the same activity. The same activity can be viewed as persisting throughout a variety of social roles and contexts. To put it in terms already used, the same activity could, at different times and at the behavioral level, be used to progress different careers.

A further avenue of enquiry that could lead to the production of a more synthetic behavioral account of tourism and leisure would be to develop a "motivational matrix" for *all* leisure similar to Leiper's (1990a) analysis of tourism. Sport, for instance, could be analyzed using Leiper's factors, or similar ones. In terms of "withdrawal," for example, "away" trips may mean that sports people are sometimes recognized as tourists (either domestic or, in the case of international touring teams, international), at least in the technical and statistical sense. This may mean that sport and tourism in some contexts are effectively "substitutes" for each other. The interrelationships between various leisure forms could be usefully mapped out in this way. This matrix could in turn be connected to the ongoing development of an overall lifestyle in which various motivational needs are met through unique mixes of leisure, family, and work careers. The advantage of this type of approach would be to provide an important linkage between the holistic thrust for synthesis and the need for measurable, quantitative relationships between different forms of leisure (including tourism) to be examined at a more specific, analytic level.

Some leisure researchers are already used to viewing leisure in terms of the broad patterns of everyday life. For example, Mannell and

Iso-Ahola note that leisure researchers have "generally not been interested in any particular leisure or recreational activity in and of itself." This is because researchers have assumed that "factors such as the range of activities, the frequency of participation, and the quality of involvement are more important to understanding the impact of leisure on people than the specific activities in which they engage." They also suggest that there is a growing tendency to see the greatest part of leisure as being embedded in the "everyday activities that make up the lives of people." In contrast, according to Mannell and Iso-Ahola, leisure researchers may have seen tourist activities as "relatively rare and infrequent leisure episodes" which, by implication, are not perceived as part of everyday life (1987:315-316). However, it is possible to conceive of tourism, alongside other leisure forms, as part of "everyday life." Planning to take trips, discussing past or future trips in social settings, reading about other places and cultures, being told about overseas holidays by work colleagues (as an aspect of the social web of the workplace), watching television programs set in other countries (that is, combining another leisure form—television viewing—with travel), etc., are all examples of tourist-related activities that are definitely embedded in the everyday lives of many people in a behavioral and social psychological sense. Travel itself is also becoming a more everyday occurrence. The popularity of the long weekend trip to an overseas or domestic destination (as a short 'getaway' holiday) means that travel is now a far more frequent type of leisure experience than it once was. So, travel and its associated everyday manifestations can be seen as part of a continually developing "travel" or 'tourist' career that constantly interacts with other leisure careers (and other life planes) to produce the overall leisure-lives of individuals.

The point advanced here is that tourism and leisure can be conceptualized in relation to the everyday context of peoples' lives in such a way that a truly synthesized behavioral understanding of the two could be conceived. The research task would obviously be immense, but it should produce understandings that avoid unnecessary fragmentation and allow for both the conceptual similarities and differences between the phenomena of leisure and tourism to be explored in a concerted and coherent manner. □ □

REFERENCES

- Allcock, J. B.
1988 Tourism as a Sacred Journey. *Society and Leisure* 11(1):33-48.
- Bodewes, T. G. W.
1981 Development of Advanced Tourism Studies in Holland. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8:35-51.
- Boorstin, D.
1964 *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo Events in American Society*. New York: Harper.
- Brown, P., and A. Veal
1988 *The Professional Preparation of Leisure Workers: Possibilities and Dilemmas*. Paper presented at the ACHPER 17th National Biennial Conference, Canberra.
- Burdge, R. J., and T. Beckers
1984 Breaking the One-Way Mirror: The Increased Isolation of North American Leisure Research. *World Leisure and Recreation* (December):11-16.

- Burton, T. L., and E. L. Jackson
1989 Leisure Research and the Social Sciences: An Exploratory Study of Active Researchers. *Leisure Studies* 8:263-280.
- Clarke, J., and C. Critcher
1985 *The Devil Makes Work: Leisure in Capitalist Britain*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Clawson, M., and J. Knetsch
1966 *Economics of Outdoor Recreation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Cohen, E.
1979 A Phenomenology of Tourist Experiences. *Sociology* 13:179-201.
- Collier, A.
1991 *Principles of Tourism* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Pitman.
- Coppock, J. T.
1982 Geographical Contributions to the Study of Leisure. *Leisure Studies* 1:1-27.
- Crick, M.
1989 Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences: Sun, Sex, Sights, Savings, and Servility. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18:307-344.
- Crompton, J.
1979 Motivations for Pleasure Vacations. *Annals of Tourism Research* 6:408-424.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M.
1975 *Beyond Boredom and Anxiety: The Experience of Play in Work and Games*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
1990 *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cushman, G.
1983 *Towards a Recreation Policy for Victoria*. Melbourne: Victorian Government Printer.
1986 Trends and Issues in Leisure and Recreation: An Australian Perspective. *World Leisure and Recreation* (February):26-31.
1989 Managing the New Zealand Leisure and Tourism Boom: Implications for Recreation Management Education. *Society and Leisure* 12:247-257.
- Dann, G.
1977 Anomie, Ego-enhancement and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 4:184-194.
- Dann, G., and E. Cohen
1991 Sociology and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 18:155-169.
- Dawson, D.
1986 Leisure and Social Class: Some Neglected Theoretical Considerations. *Leisure Sciences* 8:47-61.
1988 Social Class in Leisure: Reproduction and Resistance. *Leisure Sciences* 10:193-202.
- deGrazia, S.
1964 *Of Time, Work and Leisure*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Deem, R.
1986 *All Work and No Play? The Sociology of Women and Leisure*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Dumazdier, J.
1960 Current Problems in the Sociology of Leisure. *International Social Science Journal* 12:526.
- Fedler, A.
1987 Are Leisure, Recreation and Tourism Interrelated? *Annals of Tourism Research* 14:311-313.
- Feyerabend, P. K.
1975 *Against Method*. London: New Left Books.
- Fridgen, J. D.
1984 Environmental Psychology and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 11:19-39.
- Glyptis, S.
1989 Lifestyles and Leisure Patterns: Methodological Approaches. *Lifestyles: Theories, Concepts, Methods and Results of Lifestyle Research in International Perspective*. Proceedings of XII World Congress of Sociology, Vol. 1:37-67. Madrid: ISA.

- Goodale, T. L.
1990 Perceived Freedom as Leisure's Antithesis. *Journal of Leisure Research* 22: 296-302.
- Graburn, N. H.
1977 Tourism: The Sacred Journey. *In* Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism, Valene Smith, ed., pp. 17-31. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hamilton-Smith, E.
1987 Four Kinds of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14:332-344.
- Harrington, M., D. Dawson, and P. Bolla
1992 Objective and Subjective Constraints on Women's Enjoyment of Leisure. *Society and Leisure* 15:203-221.
- Haukeland, J. V.
1990 Non-travellers: The Flip Side of Motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research* 17: 172-184.
- Henderson, K. A.
1990a Anatomy is not Destiny: A Feminist Analysis of the Scholarship on Women's Leisure. *Leisure Sciences* 12:229-239.
1990b The Meaning of Leisure for Women: An Integrative Review of the Research. *Journal of Leisure Research* 22:228-243.
- Henderson, K. A., M. D. Bialeschki, S. M. Shaw, and V. J. Freysinger
1989 A Leisure of One's Own: A Feminist Perspective on Women's Leisure. State College: Venture Publishing.
- Henderson, K. A., D. Stalnaker, and G. Taylor
1988 The Relationship between Barriers to Recreation and Gender-role Personality Traits for Women. *Journal of Leisure Research* 20:69-80.
- Hoyenga, K. B, and K. T. Hoyenga
1984 Motivational Explanations of Behavior. Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Hughes, G.
1992 Tourism and the Geographical Imagination. *Leisure Studies* 2:45-56.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E.
1980 The Social Psychology of Leisure and Recreation. Dubuque: W. M. C. Brown.
1989 Motivation for Leisure. *In* Understanding Leisure and Recreation: Shaping the Past, Charting the Future, E. L. Jackson and T. L. Burton, eds., pp. 247-280. Pennsylvania: Venture.
- Jackson, E. L.
1982 Recreation Activity Preferences, Reasons for Participating and the Satisfaction of Needs. Edmonton: Alberta Recreation and Parks.
1988 Leisure Constraints: A Survey of Past Research. *Leisure Sciences* 10:203-215.
1991 Special Issue on Leisure Constraints/Constrained Leisure. *Leisure Sciences* 13:273-352.
- Jafari, J.
1990 Research and Scholarship: The Basis of Tourism Education. *Journal of Tourism Studies* 1:33-41.
- Jafari, J., and J. R. B. Ritchie
1981 Towards a Framework for Tourism Education: Problems and Prospects. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8:13-34.
- Kaplan, M.
1960 Leisure in America. New York: Wiley.
- Kelly, J. R.
1983 Leisure Identities and Interactions. London: Allen and Unwin.
1987 Freedom to Be: A New Sociology of Leisure. New York: MacMillan.
1990 Leisure and Common Life in New Zealand. Paper presented to the Life in New Zealand Data Release Conference, Wellington.
- Kuhn, T. S.
1970 The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lieper, N.
1979 The Framework of Tourism: Towards a Definition of Tourism, Tourist and Tourist Industry. *Annals of Tourism Research* 4:390-407.

- 1990a *Tourism Systems: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Occasional Paper No. 2. Department of Management Systems, Massey University, New Zealand.
- 1990b *Partial Industrialisation of Tourism Systems*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 17:600-605.
- 1992 *Whole Tourism Systems: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Structures, Functions, Environmental Issues and Management*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Management Systems, Massey University, New Zealand.
- MacCannell, D.
1976 *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: Macmillan.
- Mannell, R. C., and S. Iso-Ahola
1987 *Psychological Nature of Leisure and Tourism Experience*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14:314-331.
- Mansfeld, Y.
1992 *From Motivation to Actual Travel*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19:399-419.
- McCormack, T.
1971 *Politics and Leisure*. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 12:168-181.
- Mercer, D.
1977 *The Factors Affecting Recreational Demand*. In *Leisure and Recreation in Australia*, D. Mercer, ed., pp. 59-68. Melbourne: Sorrett.
- Mieczkowski, Z. T.
1981 *Some Notes on the Geography of Tourism: A Comment*. *The Canadian Geographer* 25:186-191.
- Mill, R. C., and A. M. Morrison
1985 *The Tourism System: An Introductory Text*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Nash, D.
1992 *Epilogue: A Research Agenda on the Variability of Tourism*. In *Tourism Alternatives: Potentials and Problems in the Development of Tourism*, Valene Smith and W. R. Eadington, eds., pp. 216-225. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Neulinger, J.
1974 *The Psychology of Leisure*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
1981 *To Leisure: An Introduction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Olszewska, A., and K. Roberts
1989 *Leisure and Lifestyle: A Comparative Analysis of Free-Time*. London: Sage.
- Parker, S. R.
1983 *Leisure and Work*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Pearce, P.
1988 *The Ulysses Factor: Evaluating Visitors in Tourist Settings*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Pieper, J.
1952 *Leisure: The Basis of Culture*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Rapoport, R., and R. N. Rapoport
1975 *Leisure and the Family Life Cycle*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Reid, L. H., R. W. McLellan, and M. Uysal
1993 *Leisure, Recreation and Tourism*. *VNR's Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Roberts, K.
1981 *Culture, Leisure, Society: The Pluralist Scenario*. In *Culture Ideology and Social Process. A Reader*, Tony Bennett, Graham Martin, Colin Mercer and Janet Woollacott, eds., pp. 265-283. London: B. T. Batsford.
- Rojek, C.
1985 *Capitalism and Leisure Theory*. London: Tavistock.
1989 *Leisure and Recreation Theory*. In *Understanding Leisure and Recreation: Shaping the Past, Charting the Future*, E. L. Jackson and T. L. Burton, eds., pp. 247-280. Pennsylvania: Venture.
- Simmons, D. G., and N. Leiper
1993 *Tourism: A Social Scientific Perspective*. In *Leisure, Recreation and Tourism*, H. C. Perkins and G. Cushman, eds., pp. 204-220. London: Longman Paul.
- Smith, S. L. J.
1988 *Defining Tourism: A Supply-Side View*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15:179-190.

- 1989 *Tourism: A Geographical Analysis*. Harlow: Longman Scientific and Technical.
- 1991 *The Supply Side Definition of Tourism: Reply to Leiper*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 18:312-314.
- Smith, S. L. J., and G. C. Godbey
1991 *Leisure, Recreation and Tourism*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19:85-100.
- Thompson, S.
1981 *Women in Sport: Is this what we want?* Women and Recreation Conference. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Recreation and Sport.
- Turner, L., and J. Ash
1975 *The Golden Hordes: International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery*. London: Constable.
- Urry, J.
1990 *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Uzzell, D.
1984 *An Alternative Structuralist Approach to the Psychology of Tourism Marketing*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 11:79-99.
- van Raaij, W. F., and D. A. Francken
1984 *Vacation Decisions, Activities and Satisfaction*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 11:101-112.
- Veal, A.
1989 *Leisure, Lifestyle and Status: A Pluralist Framework for Analysis*. *Leisure Studies* 8:141-154.
- Wearing, B., and S. Wearing
1988 *All in a Day's Leisure: Gender and the Concept of Leisure*. *Leisure Studies* 7: 111-123.

Submitted 8 October 1990

Resubmitted 18 June 1993

Accepted 10 March 1994

Refereed anonymously

Coordinating Editor: Robert W. McLellan