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THESIS ABSTRACT

Mobility, a constant in the world of modernity, associated with fluidity, liquidity and flow has acquired new dimensions in late modern society due to the increasing and cumulative impact of innovations in communication and transport technologies. These developments have seen individual’s voluntary crossing borders and boundaries in ever-greater numbers in pursuit of opportunities and self-fulfilment. Travel and tourism, as global geographic movement and as a manifestation of mobility has come to be seen as a significant dimension within these global mobile movements. A developing research approach, centered on a new mobilities paradigm has emerged to illuminate some of the intersecting mobilities of capital, knowledge, ideas, danger, information and bodies that constitute and have enabled these global movements. While statistics can tell us in quite general terms the scale and spread of global tourist mobilities against a background of globalisation, the mobilities paradigm both re-establishes modern tourism’s place as a fundamental element in shaping the imagination as well as shaping societies. It also opens up a series of questions about the processes by which distinct forms of tourism emerge, and how they express themselves as flows or mobility cultures with distinctly mobile patterns (of consumption).

One particular form of tourism characterised by extensive spatial mobility is associated with budget independent travellers (backpackers), who are routinely characterised by time and space flexibility, a capacity for risk and unpredictability and who place an emphasis on immersion in local cultures and places as they move from place to place and sensation to sensation. As a (alternative) mobility culture that celebrates movement, made up of geographically dispersed individuals deploying shared socio-spatial imaginaries and practices that are generative of intrinsic signifying meaning, their global spread and scope involves social, political, environmental, cultural and economic dimensions. By arguing backpackers have real human experiences as they move in a complex lived world, I unpack from the inside, a very visible but little understood and under researched mobile grouping whose mobility is practiced and performed within abstract and mosaic landscapes. Previous research into backpacking has been primarily been through means of ethnography, worked primarily within single disciplines, obscuring as much about the phenomena than they expose, rarely noting its connection with wider perspectives on mobility (and immobility) and revealing little about how backpacking is practiced, performed, enabled, mobilised, enacted, sustained, manipulated, regulated, contextualised and governed by politics, processes, objects, systems and networks.

This dissertation reflecting a multi/post disciplinary agenda draws on a physical, geographic and intellectual engagement/immersion with the landscapes of practice and mobility to which backpackers relate and belong. Through a multi-paradigmatic and bricoleur approach this ‘imagined world’ (community) is illuminated, the approach finding profound human drama and social complexity played out across ‘networks of mobility’. Through multiple methods, I locate backpacker’s performative conventions
and explore the practice-specific details of their mobility, their embodied (bodily) performance of backpacking, their meaning-making agency and their particular way of ‘being-in-the-world’. Using Bourdieuan concepts such as cultural capital and the field, a bricolage enables new perspectives, dimensions and knowledge relating to this form and type of tourism, including an innovative reflection and conceptualisation of a ‘backpacker habitus’. Seeking to make a ‘quilt’ from ideas, notes, observations, interviews, practices, literature, blog entries, stories and conversations to create something more, something new, based on what I have come to know and continue to learn about their life-world, this dissertation sought to remove the inhibitions of disciplinary regulation.

This dissertation generates a composite (but evolving and partial) picture of a global phenomenon, where conscious (and beyond conscious) forms of desire, motivation, belief and action can lead an individual to redraw boundaries in their life, their search for new openings, beginnings, rhythms or possibilities propelling them towards an imagined world (community) that promises, but also demands so much. Moving to a quite different logic to other tourists and other mobility streams, I argue backpackers learn as they navigate this world in which they seek distinction, their skills and knowledge over time and space generating dispositions that enable them to navigate landscapes of mobility and practice or ‘travellerscapes’ (scapes) successfully. I also argue that the dispositions that fabricate and sustain their life-world also influence the worlds they eventually return to, since long lasting dispositions may affect a person’s habitus, influencing individuals if mobilised as actions or practices in particular contexts. Generating new insights into (alternative) mobilities in motion, I offer in this dissertation a refreshing analysis of an extremely complex and multidimensional global phenomenon, contributing to methodological innovation through the use of data in a bricolage, building on the literature to consider how geographically dispersed individuals can enact, perform and combine mobility. I argue (tourist) mobilities should challenge policy makers, researchers, managers and others to think again about emerging mobility cultures, the bricolage suggesting new thinking about the ways individuals move, dwell, communicate and live in the 21st century.

**Keywords:** imagined worlds (communities), tourism, backpacking, mobilities, field, bricolage, Bourdieu, habitus, travellerscapes, (sub)cultural capital
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Thesis Abstract**  
**Table of Contents**  
**List of Tables and Figures**  
**Acknowledgements**  
**Publications**  
**Declaration**

**Chapter One – Introduction**
1.1 Introduction  
1.2 Tourism Mobilities  
1.3 Imagined Worlds (Communities)  
1.4 Backpacker Mobilities  
1.5 Dissertation Outline  
1.6 Chapter Summary

**Chapter Two - From Counterculture to Backpacking: Re-mapping Budget Independent Travel**
2.1 Introduction  
2.2 The Counterculture  
2.2.1 The Drift East  
2.2.2 Paradise Now: Drifting  
2.3 Backpacking  
2.3.1 The Working Holiday Maker (WHM)  
2.3.2 The Flashpacker  
2.3.3 The Gapper  
2.3.4 Backpacker Tours  
2.4 Chapter Summary

**Chapter Three - Backpacker Mobilities and the Politics of Mobility**
3.1 Introduction  
3.2 Ideologies of Mobility  
3.3 Backpacker Mobilities  
3.4 The Politics of Mobility  
3.4.1 The Counterculture: Rising in the West and Setting in the East.  
3.4.2 The Politics of Mobility: The Nation State  
3.4.3 The Politics of Mobility: Privilege and Power  
3.4.4 The Politics of Mobility: Differential Mobilities  
3.4.5 The Politics of Mobility: Chains of Implications  
3.5 Imagined Worlds – Real Tourism  
3.6 Chapter Summary

**Chapter Four - Research Methodology**
4.1 Introduction  
4.1.2 Purpose of this Study  
4.2 Backpacking Research  
4.3 New Mobilities Paradigm (NMP)  
4.4 Research Paradigms  
4.5 Research Strategy  
4.6 Ethnomethodology (EM)  
4.6.1 Participant Observation  
4.6.2 Semi-Structured Interviews
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7 The Qualitative Bricoleur</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.1 Study limitations and delimitations</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2 Researcher Position</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.3 Blogging as Bricoleur</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Chapter Summary</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Five – Travellerscapes (Scapes) and the Field.</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Introduction</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Land, landscape to the Travellerscapes</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 A Short History of the Scapes</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 The Media and the Scapes</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1 Writing the Landscape: Producing the Other</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 The Scapes and the Logic of the Field</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Producing the Scapes</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.1 Networks of Mobility (NOM)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.2 The Hippie Trail</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.3 Sense of Place</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Chapter Summary</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Six - Mobility Systems and Spaces of Consumption</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Introduction</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Old Worlds: New Systems</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Technologies of Mobility: transporting the Subject</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Spaces of Mobility: Infrastructures for Mobility</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Backpacker Hostels</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.1 Backpacker Hostels: Network Power</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5.2 Backpacker Hostels: Performing Hostels</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Backpacker Enclaves</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Contextualising the Imagination</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8 Chapter Summary</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Seven - Habitus and the Performance of Backpacking</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Introduction</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Reflexivity and Deterrioralisation</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 The (western) Backpacker Habitus</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.1 The Habitus and the Travellerscapes</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.2 The Habitus and (Sub)cultural capital</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.3 The Habitus and the Body</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 The Strategic Backpacker Habitus (position)</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 The Tactical Backpacker Habitus (position)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Inter-Subjective Interplay</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 The non-western backpacker habituses</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Chapter Summary</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Eight - Landscapes of Power: Habitus Performed</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Introduction</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Managing Backpacking: Let the Right One in</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Over-Determination and over-there</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Technologies of the Self: Hospitality Exchange</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.1 Couchsurfing: Mobility and Motility Capital</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.2 Couchsurfing and Social Capital</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.3 Couchsurfing: House and Home</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Utopia Redux</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Chapter Summary</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Chapter Nine – A situated and partial bricolage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Introduction</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Old Worlds: New Ways of Looking</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 The Backpacker Habitus</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 The Traveller(s)</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 The Future of Backpacking and Contribution to Knowledge</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5.1 Implications for future research</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5.2 Recommendations for further research</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5.3 Implications for management action</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5.4 Recommendations for management action</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 Reflection</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glossary</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: External labeling and internal identification 51

Table 2: Backpacker typology created by Van Egmond (2007) 54

Table 3: Published material about backpacker tourism, based on ethnography or ethnographic methodology 102

Table 4: New boundary crossing demonstrates complex interrelationships and transnational activity, where dualisms no longer apply 271

Figure 1: Arjun Appadurai’s (1996) landscapes of ‘Global Cultural Flows’ 150
The Stone
Is a perfect creature
equal to itself
obedient to its limits
filled exactly
with a stony meaning
with a scent which does not remind one of anything
does not frighten anything away does not arouse desire
its ardour and coldness
are just and full of dignity
I feel a heavy remorse
When I hold it in my hand
and its noble body
is permeated by false warmth
stones cannot be tamed
to the end they will look at us
with a calm very clear eye


This thesis is dedicated to my father, Michael O’ Regan and my late beloved mother, Eileen O’ Regan (née Punch). Without their help, support and understanding over the years of education, work and travel, the latest (academic) journey would not have begun. This dissertation would not have happened without the support and help of my supervisors, Professor Peter Burns and Dr. Lyn Pemberton, my sisters, Kay and Annette, my brothers, Tom and Noel and my brother in law Brendan Shields. I also want to thank the PhD student’s whom I have worked, gossiped and socialised with over the years: Christina, Mary-Beth, Nadia, Carla, Maria, Alberto, Illias, Geoff and Angelos. I also want to thank the Royal Geographic Society for their Travel Bursary, administrative support from Merz Hoare and the opportunities and funding provided by the University of Brighton through the School of Service Management, the Centre for Tourism Policy Studies (CENTOPS) and the School of Computing, Mathematical and Information Sciences. Stay Classy, Eastbourne.
Previous elements of this thesis were publishers in the following book chapters and journals.


DECLARATION

I declare that the research contained in this thesis, unless otherwise formally indicated within the text, is the original work of the author. The thesis has not been previously submitted to this or any other university for a degree, and does not incorporate any material submitted for a degree.

Signed: _________________________________

Dated: _________________________________
Chapter One: Introduction.
1.1 Introduction.

Movement, motion and mobility have always been central to what it means to be human, a facet of existence, without which societies would not function. However, mobility, a constant in the world of modernity has acquired new dimensions in late modern (postmodern / second modernity) society due to the increasing and cumulative impact of innovations and development of information, communication and transport technologies; developments which have seen individuals becoming increasingly integrated into various global networks and ‘perspectival landscapes’, holding the ‘potential to transform everyday time and space’ (Green, 2002: 281). Global ~scapes (Appadurai, 1996) have emerged through people, media, technology, finance, and ideology – dimensions that reflect the history, language and politics of the different actors that inhabit them, whose ideas, images, knowledge, information, objects, symbols and capital circulate in complex material, physical, imaginative and virtual flows. This capacity to grasp and experience the world as we move though it is constitute of a process we now call ‘globalisation’, described as a process fuelled by, and resulting in, flows of goods, services, money, commodities, people, information and culture across the world that do not observe national borders, boundaries or other kinds of barriers (Held et al, 1999).

For Robertson (2003: 3-5), the origins of globalisation lie in the ‘interconnections’ that have slowly enveloped humanity since the earliest times where people have globalised themselves, co-operating to construct communities, clans, nations and civilisations. From explorers, missionaries, emigrants, exiles, domestic servants, colonial officers, military personnel to migrants and tourists, spatial (geographic) movement has been constitutive and a result of globalisation, which itself has come in three waves. The first wave starting in the 16th century and is linked with European voyages of discovery and the expanding trade networks and strategies of conquest. The second wave began in the 19th century with Western industrialisation, colonial expansion through imperial conquest and trade in the non-western world. While these two waves meant individuals and peoples moved as missionaries, soldiers, sailors, administrators, settlers, slaves and traders, forming extensive links across the world, much of this movement was a ‘must’ and / or an ‘obligation’ and even ‘forced’ (Clifford, 1997; Urry, 2000a). Robertson argues the current wave of globalisation started after world war two with the development of new international institutions, followed by the end of the cold war and the innovation and proliferation of new
information, communication and transport technologies. When combined with social, cultural, political, economic restructuring such as greater work flexibility and affluence, it has led to transnationalism, greater global interconnectedness and deterritorialisation, characterised by the mobility not only of people but goods, capital, machines, dangers, power, ideas and symbols at a micro and local level but also across borders and boundaries at ever greater scale, scope and speed.

As mobility becomes part of everyday life, from business, leisure to friendships, from the adoption of fixed and mobile devices to augmented and virtual reality, spatial mobility is becoming central to people’s lives, involving the commute to work (job-related spatial mobility), long-distance relationships, weekend commutes, second home ownership, seasonal work, foreign assignments, long business trips or temporary migration. Intensive and extensive forms of global interdependence and interconnectedness have manifested itself in modern society, helped by the media and new technological innovations, transforming the world and ushering in a ‘new age of mobility’ (Ki-Moon, 2008, 2009) that is helping to articulate a new global sense of global connectivity and awareness (Creswell, 2006), from which narratives and ideologies can be constructed. The most ordinary of people at the most ordinary of times can now ‘deploy their imaginations in the practice of their everyday lives’ (Appadurai, 1996: 5), the expansion of many individual horizons through desire and mobility fantasies, seeing persons and groups deal with the realities of moving or having to move. Globalising processes and flows are encouraged and enabled by ‘supranational organisations and also existing states of nation-states that are captured and reorganized by transnational groups’ (Robinson, 2004: 109), exampled by organisations such as the United Nations, the World Economic Forum, the G20 and the World Bank who advocate global trade and the increased circulation of global capital and people. In promoting spatial mobility and the perquisite infrastructure to enable it, Ban Ki-Moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations, argues that legal mobility mitigates against criminal networks, illegal migration, social tension and discrimination, bringing millions out of poverty and accelerating progress throughout the world (Ki-Moon, 2008). This ‘new age of mobility’ has led people to cross borders in ever-greater numbers inside and outside of quotidian realities, in pursuit of opportunities and possibilities, hoping to realise their potential and a better life, the discourses of mobility (fluidity, liquidity, freedom, independence and flow) increasingly coupled with geographic (spatial, corporeal, physical) movement with people moving across the globe and establishing (and becoming embedded in) global networks and connections for a variety of reasons. While the first two
waves of globalisation were viewed through the spectacles of religion, war, civilisation, nation or race (Robertson, 2003), ‘the weakening of older collective solidarities and block identities’ (Hall, 1989: 118-119) means the breach of boundaries and borders is increasingly part of individual life-biographies, where everybody seems to have a mobility related aspiration, plan or project, suggesting and informing novel forms of identity as individuals seek a sense of self, place and community in a ‘runaway world’ (Giddens, 1991).

As we become part of a world in motion, individuals are drawing upon their imagination and the collective imagination, the capacity to move (circulation) becoming an essential condition in a globalised world (Bauman, 1998; Sheller and Urry, 2006). However, differential and relational mobilities mean individuals have very different access, capacity and control over their mobility. While some individuals who move for pleasure and work are embedded in broader circuits of power, their world an infinite collection of possibilities (Bauman, 2001), (their mobility related aspirations, projects and lifestyles often transcending national boundaries), others are ascribed mobility with little control over their geographical movement, given access to particular kinds of places and to the paths that allow them to move to and from such spaces. There are also those who are wholly detached, at the receiving end or are excluded from these global networks and connections, often victim to global flows, immobile and place bound (Massey, 1993; Bauman, 1998). While the former have been promoted as an opportunity for producing new forms of deterritorialised global citizens with a global cosmopolitan belonging (Holmes, 2001; Urry, 2007); those whose movement is forced due to poor geography, political instability, conflict, environmental degradation or poor governance are often blamed for the disruption to traditional notions of identity, social cohesion, community and local belonging.

While positive meanings such as progress, freedom and opportunity have been historically associated with spatial mobility from the west, where economically privileged, white, European males embarked on voyages and heroic journeys motivated by educational, scientific, and recreational purposes, their access to powerful mobility systems and spaces was in stark contrast to those confined to less powerful systems and spaces that lack spatial range and speed. However, as larger numbers of people are moving (or are forced to move); commuting, moving and connecting for a range of personal, cultural, political, economic, sporting and leisure reasons, mobility has become a more complex phenomenon that demands ever more sophisticated transnational, post/inter disciplinary
and theoretically oriented perspectives. Scholars such as John Urry, Mimi Sheller, Nigel Thrift and Tim Cresswell have urged us to think beyond the physicality and spatial elements - the actual business of moving from A to B and look at mobility, the different ways in which people are mobile, the social meanings they accord to spaces and movements as well as the rhythms, solidarities, connections, proximities and encounters they seek. Since Cresswell (2006: 2) pointed out that mobility is ‘more central to both the world and our understanding of it than ever before’, there has been a proliferation of alternative figurations of post humanist subjectivity (Braidotti, 2006), making the very vocabulary in which we discuss questions of mobility very value laden, as imaginations of mobility inform judgments about people and their mobile practices.

From the itinerant-worker, illegal alien, globetrotter, tourist, citizen, hobo, transnational criminal, wanderer, international student, terrorist, cross border sex-worker, second home owner, holidaymaker, cyclist, gypsy, vagabond, walker, guest worker, exile, environmental activist, hitchhiker, business person, sports star, asylum seeker, refugee, professional surfer, artist, academic, soldier, scientist, commuter and the early retired, it seems the whole world is on the move. Our awareness of these mobile agents / (alternative) mobility cultures over spatial-temporal space has also increased, strongly related to the speed of communication, media and the mobility of images and ideas, given these figurations and their mobile practices fill our computer and television screens, literature, imagination and discussions. The 2009 Human Development Report notes that nearly one billion people are on the move both within their own countries and overseas, with at least three per cent of the world’s population (200 million) living outside their countries of birth while the equivalent figure in 1960 amounted to 75 million persons or 2.5 per cent of the world’s population. The increasing scale and intensity of human travel has taken on immense dimensions, one that scholars are keen to examine, not only within national territories (internal) but also across national borders (external), as the picture of a seemingly chaotic world of movement, with rich and poor, the middle class and the dispossessed all physically and geographically mobile. The age of mobility seems to be demanding participation in networks of motion and movement, with scholars increasingly seeking to make sense of it, often tending to group such movement into different categories such as immigration, emigration, return migration, global elites, tourism, temporary migration and transnational movements rather than looking behind these categories. Such macro descriptions are often value laden and fail to uncover the ‘other, socially differentiated realities’ (Favell et al, 2006: 2) that lie behind the migrant, transnational elites or tourist. As much as there is no typical profile of migrants,
given they include fruit pickers, nurses, construction workers, academics and computer programmers, tourism is an equally diverse phenomena. There has been only recent recognition that tourism mobilities have become an inherent quality of globalisation and everyday life, with the freedom to move freely and for leisure, primarily from within western countries where ‘productivity is great enough, the horizons broad enough and the social mobility significant enough to nourish the touristic impulse’ (Nash, 1977: 40) becoming a stratifying factor of our late-modern or postmodern times (Bauman, 1998).

1.2 Tourism Mobilities.

Central to this dissertation is the idea that as old forms of movement lose their attractiveness, new forms of mobility are sought by individuals, highlighting how ‘[p]ostmodern individuals are thus constant (space and time) tourists’ (Davin, 2005: 176) as they search for new belongings, often at the expense of older certainties, belongings and loyalties. This desire means the world is now home to many distinct mobile cultures, forming ethnoscapes of moving peoples, which are a central feature of second modernity (Appadurai, 1996), and including tourists who are generally ‘enabled, given license, encouraged and facilitated’ (Cresswell, 2006: 735). Their escape of affluence is accompanied and is enabled by technologies that carry them, their money, ideas, goods, capital, hopes and dreams at greater speeds and scales across the globe (Harvey, 1989), modern societies are now pressured ‘to provide the mobility potentials for a maximum amount of free movement’ (Kesselring, 2008: 84) even though at the same time, they ‘realize the impossibility and the counterproductive effects of increasing mobilities’ (ibid, 84). While tourism is one of the manifestations of globalisation (Urry, 2002), it is ‘often forgotten’ (Haldrup, 2004: 434), characterised as ‘first world’, ‘temporary’, ‘marginal’, ‘disposable’, ‘ephemeral’, ‘peripheral’, and an unnecessary deviation from everyday life, producing bodies in thrall to mobility fantasies and dark desires. Indeed, the label has been stretched to all touristic movement occurring away from the 'home environment' which is voluntary and temporary and doesn’t involve paid work, implying an inevitable return home rather than movement which is circular or peripatetic.

Even though aesthetic, subjective and emotive, rather than objective or detached (Harvey, 2001), tourism’s temporality and privilege has mostly been treated in a rather static and deterministic manner, often described as a system where consumers from tourist generating regions are given license by western societies to transit through to spatially
fixed tourist-receiving regions which endow (political, cultural, social) meanings on them, where they spend their leisure time within bounded destinations and resorts before returning home (Leiper, 1990). Place-based units such as ‘home’, ‘work’ and ‘holiday’ remain at the core of our understanding of tourism, contrasting tourism with home geographies and ‘everydayness’ (Foth and Adkins, 2005; MacCannell, 1976/1999; Lengkeek, 2001; Suvantola, 2002; Urry, 1990), where destination managers facilitate the tourist’s ability to experience Otherness / attractions / destinations in a meaningful way by signifying cultural exchange value (Jamal and Hill, 2002). This view characterises tourism as bringing the consumer to the product, increasing numbers of ‘tourists’ reaching their target region, with little to no distinction left between the journey (transit) and destination (Zillinger, 2008), as specialised intermediaries help make sense of the ‘product’ for tourists by providing them with opportunities to escape their ‘habits of mind’ (de Botton, 2003: 59). This characterisation of a tourist system where tourists experience ‘a temporary reversal of everyday activities … a no-work, no-care, no-thrift situation’ (Cohen, 1972: 181) has over directed attention to the influence of the ‘tourist destination’ at receiving regions and the consequences of a tourism system developing there. Its participants are characterised as lacking attachment, commitment, obligation and reflexivity, seemingly lacking the complexity, seriousness of other more ‘permanent’ or ‘serious’ movement such as migration, Diaspora, pilgrimage and transnational business, wherein subjects gain agency through their movement or become transformed or empowered through more ‘driven’ movement. While the present wave of globalisation has widened leisure participation considerably, ‘tourism’ and ‘tourist’ are still burdened with cultural, political, social, economic and environmental baggage, while tourism theory remains linked to a ‘spatial logic’ where ‘touristic’ activities are experienced within specialised ‘leisure spaces’ (Urry, 2001), brute movement of their energised corporeal bodies ‘fashioned by culturally coded escape attempts’ (Edensor, 2001: 61).

The representations of tourist experiences and social/mobile practices created by the tourism industry are intrinsically corporeal: their representation of sun-kissed corporeal bodies; alive, natural, heroic and rejuvenated remain powerful (Urry, 2001), the representations of bodies moving seamlessly through time-space powerful referents and icons in contemporary society. Often characterised as static, linear, habitual and ascribed rather than agency driven, assertive and empowering, statistics tell us in quite general terms the scale and spread of tourists. The UNWTO notes that 924 million tourist arrivals were recorded in 2008, representing a growth of two percent over 2007 figures. While
tourism mobility related projects or lifestyles are an inherent quality of globalisation, characterised by movement and are arguably an integral part of modern life, social science research has to a large degree ignored the movement of people for tourism even though tourist mobilities have become a significant part of everyday lives and central to contemporary socialites (Urry, 2002). Tourism research has primarily sought to investigate the aggression, energy and power embedded in the above numbers, the social, cultural, economic and environmental impacts of tourist mobilities on so-called static, stable communities, with little attention focused on the centrality of mobility in the lives of those who move and those in the receiving destinations. The statistics noted above, however useful, assume tourism is a single phenomena where the tourist role is pre-arranged and produced by a dedicated tourism industry (the provided object) which is consumed by an unreflexive, habitual population whose privilege and affluence provides them the opportunity to embrace a ‘right to roam’ (Franklin, 2001: 126).

Bruner (1991) rejects this deterministic position that confines the tourist to a discourse constituted outside their own physicality, outside their own ‘selves’, as he states that ‘of course tourists have agency .. there are no persons without agency, without active selves’ (Bruner, 2005: 12), with every possibility of making or unmaking social constructed identities. Even if every tourist had access to the same spatial and financial resources, individuals will choose different types and forms of leisure given ‘our choices carrying symbolic meanings and messages about ourselves to others’ (Holden, 2005: 52). Urry (1995) notes how the middle and upper-classes drew distinction between different modes of transport (sea, air), different transport forms (packaged, scheduled) and between visitations to different places as well as the type of tourism activities pursued there. While tourists are typified, classified and organised into various contexts, typologies, taxonomies, markets and segments, there has been less acknowledgment of how collective imaginations can expand the room for individual maneuver, so called ‘special-interest’ or ‘niche’ risk becoming a list of ‘instances, case studies and variations’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001), that don’t link imagination, subjectivity, agency and identity through a mobilities perspective, its absence from accounts of tourism, meaning important connections are not made (Cresswell, 2006). Seeing mobility as ‘a way of being in the world’ (Cresswell, 2006: 3), ways and styles of movement become an expressive source of identity formation, when attachment styles and collective rhythms become bound up with ‘agency’ and ‘becoming’; tourism’s hybrid nature routinely often glossed over to minimise questions as to how movement is made meaningful, and how the ‘resulting ideologies of mobility become
implicated in the production of mobile practices’ (Cresswell, 2006: 21). Rather than always a habitual manifestation of privileged western societies, cultural dupes whose mobilities are ‘produced’, studies of mobilities suggest complex, relational and interwoven places, persons, technologies and practices connected through performances, creating various spatio-temporal orderings where ‘transitional identities may be sought and performed’ (Edensor, 2000: 333). The reflexivity of globalisation has sparked an awareness of the power of mobility and the diversity it enables for individuals to explore consumerist post-modern aesthetic and intensified forms of individualised identities (Savage et al, 2005), supporting new encounters, belongings and the ‘possibility of adjusting understandings, relationships and self-actualization’ (Crouch, 2006: 361). Cresswell (2006: 44) notes the way in which identities are produced and performed through mobility, more precisely spatial mobility, travel away from home provoking ‘new concepts, new ways of seeing and being’ (Robertson, 1994: 2), enabling occasioned, intermittent and sustained encounters, connections with certain places, people, cultures seem obligatory and desirable.

Their ability to change however often depends on the support of people other than traditional societal groupings such as ‘family’, ‘household’, ‘couple’ or a ‘nation’ (Urry, 1995), the drive for a mobility (and mobility related practices) that is not ordinary, to be ‘different,’ to stand out, often sustained and constrained by a new environment and the mental, physical, dialogical and physical presence of others. Individual identification with imagined worlds (communities) offers a way of belonging at different scales and points of time and settings, producing very real consequences, connections and encounters with particular objects, people, places and events. These embodied worlds link interior narratives of person-hood with exterior experiences and practices (Crang, 2004) and can be used as a vehicle to represent to ourselves (and to others) in a creative manner, where a new subjectivity and lifestyle can emerge out of a reflexive autobiography, described as ‘points of attachment from which one could experience the world’ (Grossberg, 1996: 101-102). These subjectivities can transform the common sense of what we know, shaping the spaces we inhabit, replacing the ‘the old stories of group (Communal) belonging’ (Bauman, 2001: 98), with ‘identity stories’ in which ‘we tell ourselves about where we came from, what we are now and where we are going’ (ibid, 99). For many, whose ‘forebodings generated out of the sense of social space imploding in upon us’ (Harvey, 1990: 427), they demand an answer to the question ‘[w]ho are we and to what space/place do we belong?’ (ibid, 427), the question of ‘[w]ho am I?’ replaced by ‘[w]ho do I want to be?’ (Desforges, 2000), a process often involving voluntary and reflexive displacement in time-space,
whereby people rearrange their social relations with regard to constraints and opportunities that these worlds provide them. Cova (1997: 311) argues that postmodern persons are not only looking for products and services which enable them to be freer, but also products and services which can link them to others, like a community, to a tribe, where mobility is a means for opening up opportunities; where ‘mobility gives people the opportunity to develop themselves socially and economically’ (Maat and Louw, 1999: 160).

1.3 Imagined Worlds (Communities).

I argue throughout this dissertation that tourism constitutes a continuum of flows, some of which are embedded in and constitute of ‘imagined worlds’ (communities) in which localised individuals envisage global possibilities, persons and images meeting ‘unpredictably, outside the certainties of home’ (Appadurai, 1996: 4), often far from their immediate realities, often with / against the prevailing moral grain of societies, where invoked displacement involves ‘relations of participation and access, the possibilities of moving into sites of activity and power, and of belonging to them in such a way as to be able to actually enact their powers’ (Grossberg, 1996: 99). Tourists have agency, involving relations of access and participation, making ‘real’ these worlds of fantasy, their capacity to mobilise the possibilities of the self, in relation to the potentialities of imagined world’s (Parish, 2008) unavailable to most, whose efforts collide with the hard boundaries and borders of life. Appadurai describes how five ‘scapes’ are the building blocks for these worlds and their new cultural formations: ethnoscapes, mediascapes, techoscapes, finanscapes and ideoscapes (Appadurai, 1990), using the common suffix ‘~scape’ to describe the resulting ‘imagined worlds’. He argues the work of imagination is a ‘constitutive feature of modern subjectivity’ that offers ‘new resources and new disciplines for the construction of imagined selves and imagined worlds’ (Appadurai, 1996: 3), their shape and boundaries depending on the angle from which they are perceived. This helps to situate the possibilities of travel and tourism in relation to the imagination and connecting subsequent displacement with other forms of mobility, ‘differentiated in their temporality and spatially’ (Williams et al, 2004: 101). Invoked as distinct aspects of personal and social identities, these imagined worlds (communities) have become integral to modern social life, mobilised through mobility fantasies but also relational mobilisations of memories and performances, emotions and atmospheres (Sheller and Urry, 2004). The ‘individual actor is the last locus of this perspectival set of landscapes, for these landscapes are eventually navigated by agents who both experience and constitute larger formations, in part from
their own sense of what these landscapes offer’ (Appadurai, 1996: 33), landscapes
‘constituted by the historically situated imaginations of persons and groups spread around
the globe’ (ibid, 33).

Talk itself of these worlds is an expression of the life-world, but the further an individual is
from the world s/he imagines or talks about, the greater the likelihood that the imagined
world will be ‘chimerical, aesthetic, even fantastic objects’ (Appadurai, 1996: 35) and will
remain unfulfilled. Geographic movement can be a powerful factor in structuring access to
these worlds, and while the flow of images, people and images are the building blocks of
the individual imagination and their imagined position in these worlds, participation is often
dependent on invoking movement, since it is movement though fluid but a unique sets of
spatial, social and temporal markers that informs and penetrate the actors’ own reality.
While some of these worlds are constitute of ‘re-imagined’, ‘recycled travel’ and
‘reconstructed’ scapes, these worlds, given that they constitute imagined selves can
become intrinsically stratified and differentiated, only taking shape as people are displaced
and re-shaped by global flows of people, technological innovations, capital, information and
ideas.

These worlds are emerging at many different scales from the local and national to the
global, reaffirm the power of mobility to set people’s lives in motion (mentally, socially and
physically) and making it ‘insufficient in tourist studies to focus only on extraordinary
practices, like sightseeing’ (Pons, 2003: 52). Tourism studies need to grasp how (media)
derived fantasies ‘have become driving forces in geographical mobility and human
becoming’ (Smith, 1994: 22), where individuals form relations with others and space, where
ongoing, embodied, active and inter-subjective movement can demonstrates agency, self-
expression, belongingness and empowerment. Analogous to a struggle for acquiring new
forms of subjectivity, where travelling somewhere, being somewhere, being some one and
moving around in, being and doing within ‘stressed landscapes’ can become an important
public identity marker and a means of transmitting to those around us some idea of who
and what we perceive ourselves to be; mobility becoming a performance through which ‘we
make statements about ourselves and acquire status’ (Pooley et al, 2005: 15). Of course,
many imagined worlds are born out of the official mind and of the entrepreneurial mentality
that surround them (Appadurai, 1996), fictional landscapes often unrealistically produced
onto realistic landscapes for political or economic purposes.
From 'Braveheart country' (Edensor, 1998b) to various literary landscapes (Crang, 2006), each world engenders their own unique differential mobilities and immobilities (Hannam, 2008). While Appadurai argues these official words can be subverted, many of them are historically constituted and implicated in the construction of a nation. They may also be inhabited only temporally, flexibility ‘inhabitated’ as part of a middle class way of life, taken on by individuals to fit their lifestyles and life-biography. Alternatively, other worlds can invoke a degree of transformation and unlearning to cultivate a self-reflexivity or a critical perspective (cf. Ahmed, 2000). These world afford opportunities to avoid standardized / routinised practices and lifestyles and mobility fantasies ‘because it entails escaping the gaze and expectations of home communities’ (Gillespie, 2006: 63), where individuals mobilise themselves to reflexively align with a set of practices and regulating principles, values or fundamental truths that one needs to master before participation (Jensen, 2009).

Social, economic, political and cultural factors combined with innovations in information and transport technologies are forming ‘the basis of the plurality of imagined worlds’ (Appadurai, 1996: 5), where individuals can connect ‘within and across different societies and regions, transport-systems, accommodation and facilities, resources, environments, technologies, and people and organizations’ (Van der Duim, 2007b: 967-968).

From queerscapes, skatescapes, foodscapes, surfscapes, seascapes, second home landscapes, to cityscapes, ~scapes link mobile practices to the forces of globalised economy. The key component, Appadurai argues, is the imagination, which ‘is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order’ (Appadurai, 1996: 31), the stressed landscapes in which they operate upheld by ‘those participating, where immersive performance can potentially gain ‘power’ ‘taste’, ‘uniqueness’ and feelings of ‘being someone’. Many of these deterritorialised populations have to construct their identities across foreign contexts, crossing borders and creating connections, experiences, socialites, togetherness, proximities, attachments, encounters and meaningful interaction with others who act as a supporting social network and audience for staging and transforming the self, inter-subjectivity preceding subjectivity as individuals inter-subjectively move in pursuit of opportunities, transformation, self-actualisation and self-fulfillment.

As knowledge, distinction and meanings only emerge and evolve in and through others, the ‘compulsion to proximity’ (Boden and Molotch, 1994) and inter-subjective movement have spatial, temporal and affective dimensions, creating self-conscious encounters, sharing and
gifting with those who share similar conceptual frames, a togetherness interlocked with reference to the fundamental truths of these worlds, ‘expressed in its own thought style, penetrating the minds of its members, defining their experience, and setting the poles of their own moral understanding’ (Douglas, 1987: 128). This identity construction ‘compasses both people’s sense of who they are (what might be termed personal identity) and their sense of who they are like, and who they are different from (what might be termed social location)’ (Skinner and Rosen, 2007: 83). As individuals seek identification with imagined worlds (communities), identities are socially constructed and continually reproduced through being physically mobile, becoming a ‘way of life’ (Urry, 2007), ‘the growing social and economic importance of leisure and a blurring between work and leisure in post-Fordist economies [that] … obscures the distinction between tourism and the everyday’ (Edensor, 2001:61).

1.4 Backpacker Mobilities.
Backpacking constitutes one such imagined world (community), demarcated as a distinct and separate cultural formation in ethnographic description and economic analysis, their imagined world constructed through performative/geographic imaginings by social actors whose membership in this imagined world (community) is continuously renewed by its practice and performances. It is characterised as coming to life as its participants are displaced in time space, the ‘warp of the stabilities is everywhere shot through with woof of human motion, as more persons and groups deal with the realities of having to move or the fantasies of wanting to move’ (Appadurai, 1990: 297). They are described as young, budget minded, independent travellers breaking routine with home, their form of movement falling within the realm of extreme mobility, a deterritorialised population who have to construct and sustain their identities as they move from geographic to geographic location with a constant high rate of change in their local environment highlighted by freedom of movement, control over their mobility and the capacity for risk and unpredictability, many travelling from anywhere from weeks to years, staying in locations for short periods before moving on. Their displacement into this world permits a form of escape and can facilitate a form of temporary ‘disengagement’ (Kaufmann, 2002), their journeys through landscapes of mobility, involving the ‘adoption of a certain discourse from which the particular representation arises’ (Relp, 1976: 53), allowing those ‘scapes’ to envelop them (mind and body), sustaining both mobilities and immobilities, their shared imagination becoming a
significant driving force for a reconstructed and recycled world infected by countercultural discourses.

I argue throughout this dissertation that a (transnational) countercultural imagination emerged in the 1950’s, where affluence and a loss of meaning against a backdrop of the cold war, saw the Beats travelling east-west through iconic American landscapes where the native Indians were positioned as custodians and south to an imaginary and more authentic Mexico. However, ‘sixties rewrote the fifties’ (Gitlin, 1987), and while the persuasive movements of the 1960’s were born in the 1950’s, it was the 1960’s, when this imagination saw tens of thousands of youth people immersing themselves in the world-view of the counterculture (Turner, 2006), promising a better life but on a global scale after the breaking down of other systems of relationships (educational, political, social) during a time of societal flux. The emergence of what the press called dropouts, longhairs, beatniks, but most commonly ‘hippies’ (Farber and Bailey, 2001) from the Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco came to sustain a disjuncture in the scapes, their domination of the countercultural landscapes for ten years having profound affects on mainstream society. These landscapes were populated by those whose collective alternatives to dominant forms of social and spatial organisation promoted temporary, spontaneous, mobile, communal, sharing; networked and autonomous living, sustaining mobility and the development of urban enclaves, social structures and technologies that were spatial, imaginative, communal and constructive. By 1967, however, these enclaves became ‘a cop-magnet and a bad sideshow’ with ‘not much room to live’ between the narks and the psychedelic hustlers, there was not much room to live’ (Thompson, 1979/1992: 155), their spatial-social exploration and collective dissent creating new worlds to explore and new designs for collective life to emerge. From the back to the land communards, new left politics to to religious ashrams, they sought to be surrounded with others like themselves.

However, it was the ‘moving images’ of the ‘east’, considered ‘free space’ that created an ‘organised drift’ from Europe to India and beyond between 1965 and 1975, bringing dispersed people together on a journey who wished to demonstrate their countercultural belonging, creating a network of places that were approximate to their countercultural values and way of seeing. While two centuries of leisure travel taught westerners how to be tourists (Stonza, 2001), these emerging ‘landscapes’ were the product of ‘ideas and

1 ‘Free space’ where ‘[t]he entire world becomes a setting for the fulfillment of publicity’s promise of the good life. The world smiles at us. It offers itself to use’ (Berger, 1972: 150).
ideologies, interest groups, and power blocks nested within particular social and economic contexts’ (Ley, 1988: 100), sociocultural constructions that did ‘not exist in a sense other than culturally’ (Shurmer-Smith and Hannam, 1994: 13). Seeking to affirm and reinforce what they thought they knew about the world, these lived, material and irregular terrains spread from Morocco to China (Faber and Bailey, 2001), as ‘moving images meet deterritorialized viewers’ (Appadurai, 1996: 4), the movement east creating boundaries and material infrastructure, constructed and propagated visually through niche media, maps and linguistically through media articles, myths and stories.

By the late 1960’s, the drift east itself evolved into an organised field of social practices, the hippie trail in particular capturing the imagination as stories, dress, airplanes, drugs, objects, money and ideas, all went into ‘doing’ the road east, tens of thousands coming to constitute a larger formation of ‘drifters’, in part from their own sense of what these landscapes could offer (Appadurai, 1996). These countercultural landscapes engendered a new subjectivity not inextricably linked to existing economic and social systems, the countercultural imagination making visible the possibility of more mobile, tribal lives. This individual identification with a global imagined world (community) acquired through self-indication (Blumer, 1969) was performed as an alternative to middle-class conformity, the adoption of values and behaviour in ideological opposition to their middle class habitus. As individuals populated the road east in greater intensity, their movement became mapped and visible, but like pilgrims, ‘they lost their battle by winning it’ (Bauman, 1995: 88), as the landscapes soon became haunted and tainted by their representations in the media who found no values that rose to the surface in this world. Even as drifters were uprooted as national government sought to close down these deterritorialised landscapes, these imaginative geographies remained charged with cultural, social and historical meaning, 'constituted by historically situated imaginations of persons and groups' (Appadurai, 1996: 33). The travel experience came to be seen ‘as providing the necessary challenges and opportunities to expand oneself in areas valued by adventurous youth: independence, adaptability, resourcefulness, open-mindedness to name but a few’ (Vogt, 1976: 27) and making it possible to throw off certain routines, formal lifestyles and roles and selves and engage the world on alternated terms (Parish, 2008), and for many, a means into a new socialised subjectivity.

This world remained an imaginary construct kept alive by alternative guidebooks, films, images and books until the mid-eighties when individuals (re)acquired a consuming
passion for new or recycled countercultural styles, their inhabitation becoming a performance through which individuals could make statements about themselves. Although much of the complex mobility systems and infrastructure associated with drifting had ceased to substantially exist, budget travel had not disappeared, the term backpacker around since the late 1970’s coming to be reused in the 1990’s to describe those individuals who were still actualising discourses attached to the counterculture, budget independent travel coming to be re-imagined at a global level as it was re-energised by information, capital, objects, transport and communication technologies and pursued by the tourism-industrial complex (Salazar, 2006), its popularity rising in tandem with a bust of globalisation that produced flows of individuals who could afford to make their way within this imagined world, one that remained seductive and bound up with geographic imaginaries of places, encounters, peoples and possible relationships.

The ways we experience mobility and the ways we move are ‘intimately connected to meanings given to mobility through representations’ (Creswell, 2006: 4), representations that are based on ways in which mobility is practiced and embodied, backing intrinsically tied up with seeking mobility ‘as an extraordinary experience’ (D’Andrea, 2006: 106), where the ‘most general form of adventure is its dropping out of the continuity of life’ (Simmel, 1971: 187 cited in Frisby, 1992: 132). Movement again became an important aspect of identity construction in the eighties, representations of backpacking characterising it not as a ‘rite of passage’ or a necessity of social convention, but an expression of whom individuals thought they might be. Giddens (1991: 114) notes there ‘are moments when the individual must launch out into something new, knowing that a decision made, or a specific course of action followed, has an irreversible quality’, when stepping out means different relations of different rhythm. For Said (2001: 404), ‘[t]he image of traveler depends not on power, but on motion, on a willingness to go into different worlds, use different idioms, and understand a variety of disguises, masks, and rhetorics. Travelers must suspend the claim of customary routine in order to live in new rhythms and rituals’.

The rhythms of this imagined world may well be invisible and often confusing as backpackers embark on their journey, inserting themselves into a complex social, spatial and temporal world, one which can exist in the four corners of the globe, demanding a great deal of embodied involvement and social, emotional and economic commitment involving the ‘socialization of space and time’ (Appadurai, 1996), in which socially situated agents struggle for individual mastery, actively engaging with this imagined world.
(community) in its active (re)production, their encounters with the world mediated through mobilities, connecting bodies with other ‘validating’ bodies and the environment that articulate a ‘structure of feeling’ (cf. Said, 1993). These landscapes, partially rewritten within complex touristic and educational discourses in the eighties have become a ‘vehicle’ for transformation, mobility a means of ‘way of being’ and ‘of becoming in the world’ (Cresswell, 2006). While not a second counter-culture, this world remains an important site for identity work, where meaningful movement enables individuals to rearrange social and spatial relations so as to develop a stronger sense of self (O’Reilly, 2006). It is a world where individuals can self-consciously attach themselves to a new (spatial and collective) subjectivity, while a temporary address offers a new individualised identity that can frame all other roles, constructed out of and developing in the landscapes (produced by mobility and a byproduct of it), their ‘ways of belonging’, operating on the plane of subjectivity that defines the kind of person they are (Grossberg, 1996).

In movement, they find meaning, in themselves, in their encounters, in their bodies as they move, their communal pulse stabilising into an organised discursive field, that can only emerge in inter-subjective movement, their subjectivity in this sense crucially spatial, ‘insofar as the world is experienced from a particular position in space-time and also in relation to the movement and trajectories of others’ (Allen and Pryke, 1999). As an imagined world, backpacking draws geographically dispersed individuals, who lay claim to this collective spatial subjectivity which is radically different from the overregulated subjectivity in the home, school or work place, expressing itself amongst shared systems of meaning, paths, rhythms and routes, demanding a subjugation of work, school and home based routines, a performance of the self that’s based on encounter, exposure and recognition to peoples, cultures and places. Rather than thinking of these landscapes as ‘destinations’ executed by ‘going places’ (Feifer, 1985), the primary concern for these individuals is moving ‘through geographic space in stylistically specified ways’ (Adler, 1989: 1368), spatially, temporally and infrastructurally anchoring themselves on circuits, routes and paths where their individual mobility related activities, practices and performances can be considered intrinsically corporeal and embodied. While many individuals will only sample this world, others will enter into a kind of psychological, physical, emotional and corporeal communion this worlds logic and values. As much imaginary as real, the perceptual/cognitive dimensions of movement in time-space produces active meaning making, produced within and bounded by socially constructed landscapes of mobility and practice, the desire to attach yourself to an imagined world (community), linking people in
patterns of passion, duty, survival, obligation, desire and commitment, their movement across landscapes held as an authentic representation and space for a self-actualising, self-motivating person (which includes questions of identity-making, agency and self-determination).

**1.5 Dissertation Outline.**

Tourism reveals lived experiences as acts of self-discovery, becoming a ‘reflexive response to a sense of loss that underpins modern society’ (Santos and Yan, 2010: 1) and the reconfiguration of social systems and relations (Krippendorf 1987; Wang 1999, 2000), the whole world increasingly placed within the grasp of individuals and groups who have become empowered by an awareness of the global. Assisting in enhancing a sense of self, reaffirming one’s own perspective on the world (Morgan and Pritchard, 2005a, Maoz, 2007a) as well as facilitating new forms of identity, contemporary tourism, therefore, is a central component of the ontological project of the self (Giddens, 1991), discourses of transformation and self-identity framing the tourist experience (Noy, 2004a), as tourists ‘seek out opportunities to discover and reconstruct narratives meaningful to them’ (Santos and Yan, 2010: 1). It is only recently that researchers have highlighted the socially constructed nature of touristic mobility under the current global regime, the compression of time and space increasing the room for maneuver that each individual has available, their need for identity affirmation, influencing choice of leisure activities (Dimanche and Samdahl, 1994) and confirming Franklin (2003: 2) who argues that tourism ‘is a central component of modern social identity formation and engagement’, and that it is ‘infused into the everyday’.

Mobilities studies and a ‘movement-driven’ social science in which movement, potential movement and blocked movement are all conceptualised as constitutive of economic, social and political relations (Urry, 2007: 43) has largely concerned itself with daily communuting, transnationalism, cosmopolitanism, Diasporas, globalisation, hybridity and glocalisation. The study of the movement of people, the impacts of movement and accompanying social and cultural consequences have rarely reached to study of tourism, since their temporary and episodic mobility often going unnoticed. Tourism is often spoken as a mass phenomenon, few taking the effort to untangle the mass mobilities that comprise it, the plurality of worlds through which different forms of touristic mobilities have increased not theorised, conceptualised or debated, their signifying practices that construct meanings
and identities often reduced to practices such as sightseeing. I argue the work of the imagination infuses life with value, and once shared and worked on a collective basis can involve moving, interactions, dwelling, and communications related practices, which function to weave a sense of connectedness in time-space and in turn serve to imagine their world as a single place. From the seduction of relocation of relatively affluent (and often senior) citizens to coastal areas and warmer climates, bikers overlanding north Africa, hitchhikers heading to a political protest to pilgrims on the road to Santiago de Compostela, individuals do not work with entirely abstract, or virtual, or mediated, or imagined worlds (communities), individuals can locate themselves in this worlds. Often anonymous and elusive, often only visible and readable by those literate in their use, these worlds are often only articulated through mobility, where specific practices are constitutive of identities. Mobility has a central role in defining participation (and renewing) multiple, simultaneous, and perspectival, and contested worlds, continually remade by the flows of people, information, money, and technology. The means through which the collective imagination conjures new worlds.

This dissertation sets out to understand the backpacking phenomenon, by acknowledging the evolution of their imagined world (community), one as I have argued was recycled through a countercultural imagination, evolving into a relatively autonomous organised social field, with its own ‘tempo, its own evolutionary laws, its own crises, in short, its specific chronology’ (Bourdieu, 1978: 821), endowed with specific rewards, struggles and values, which gives rise to distinct mobilities, stabilities, moorings, systems, spaces, places, immobilities, myths, stories, trajectories, networks, knowledge, struggles and powers. The objective of this research is to uncover the ‘most deeply buried structures’ of their social world as well as the ‘mechanisms’ that tend to ensure its reproduction or transformation (Bourdieu, 1996: 1), to investigate how very different individuals can sustain a common experience of the world and a shared conceptual framework, transforming themselves (and being transformed). The aim is to understand the ‘everyday life world of common sense’ (Johnson, 2008), the elements that structure social order, the extent to which competent practical social and spatial action involves ‘mastery of natural language’ (Hutchinson et al, 2008: 95) and building a conceptual / theoretical scaffold around it. While not an objective account of reality, the objective was not to approach backpacking as a detached, clinical and invisible researcher or approach the field with a fixed criteria, so as

\[2\] Many can not enter this worlds and even those with the available resources might be unable to enter them routinely.
to observe, measure and quantify. I sought a ‘methodology’ that corresponded as close as possible to the structure of their social world, its socialisation processes and their everyday lived practices, which when taken together as an assemblage, constitutes a performance.

While historically associated with transport studies, the ‘mobilities turn’ has grown to explore how ‘various forms of mobility (virtual, symbolic, and corporeal) are being imagined, configured, and traversed across the globe’ (Gogia, 2006: 360), and has recently been applied to criminology, social work, transport, Diaspora studies, migration and place making (Kaplan, 1996; Urry, 2007). The new mobilities paradigm (NMP) is used as a guiding meta-theory, representing a set of foundational beliefs that have persisted across the social sciences over the past decade, driving a vast amount of debate regarding what is real, and what can be known about what is real, drawing an image of a world made up of various mobility streams, practices, systems, cultures and spaces. I come to use a multi-paradigmatic and bricoleur approach to investigate the world of backpacking and its inhabitants, seeking to make a ‘quilt’ from the ideas, notes, observations, interviews, practices, literature, blog enteries, performances, stories and conversations to create something more, something new based on what I have come to know and continue to learn. Through this process, I came to use and extend Pierre Bourdieu’s concepts of the habitus and the field as a heuristic framework and deconstructive foil, to loosen the theoretical shackles that discursively shape our understanding of backpacking, of what was known, and hence what could be known; an approach that replaces a formal literature review.

Chapter two, entitled ‘From Counterculture to Backpacking: Re-mapping Budget Independent Travel’ outlines the articulation of countercultural imagination as a social, temporal and spatial practice, their drift east to India a catalyst for unfilled participatory goals. Given how the imagination is ‘now central to all forms of agency … and is the key component of the new global order’ (Appadurai, 1996: 31), this chapter argues that today’s backpackers draw heavily upon a stock of knowledge which is culturally, socially and historically conditioned. This chapter follows the development of backpacking (the cultural narratives are structurally the same) from the Beats, Haight-Ashbury to the road east during a period of societal flux, which saw increasing mobility, changing social structures, innovative technologies, new media and affluence in the west. The countercultural exploration of alternative forms of social and spatial organisation and the emergence of new countercultural landscapes populated by the so called ‘hippies’ provided access to an
alternative way of life, their spatial, imaginative, communal and constructive imagination sustaining a move east where hippies, anti-war activities, freaks, heads and beats traversed Europe to India and beyond. Imagined because few knew or would meet each other, ‘yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’ (Anderson, 1991: 6), they carried countercultural values from which an ideology of movement was born, the journey harmonising general beliefs, attitudes and sentiments into a distinct embodied way of being in the world, sustaining landscapes of mobility and practice and reproducing spaces, systems and networks. This chapter notes how the journey created its own logic and value system that promoted solidarity and a rejection of mainstream tourism, as mobility was made creative and subversive, their disrespect of the established order attracting tens of thousands before its inevitable collapse and re-birth as backpacking in the 1990’s.

Chapter three, entitled, ‘Backpacker Mobilities and the Politics of Mobility’ searches for the meanings behind backpacker mobilities as individuals increasingly dwell in various mobilities (Urry, 2000a), spatial mobility becoming both a societal goal and an individual aspiration. Because mobility discourses now lay ‘right at the heart of some of the foundational ideologies of the modern world’ (Cresswell, 2006: 166), this chapter places backpacking within a social, economic, historical and cultural context, making connections with the emergence of drifting and understanding the current context in which individuals build their ‘fantasies of wanting to move’ (Appadurai, 1996: 34). Thrift (1996: 305) argues that ‘mobility is a cultural hypothesis which involves clear and dangerous elements of exaggeration. On the other hand, it also has to be asked whether the modern world can be understood (or even seen) through a sedentary gaze’. This chapter disperses many of the myths about backpacker mobility, investigating its relationship to privilege, politics and power, placing it within a wider mobilities perspective to examine whether backpacking is the ‘softer’ alternative it purports to be; a world more real than tourism, its inhabitants held to be more responsible, ethical, humanitarian, environmentally aware and cosmopolitan (Germann-Molz, 2006a,b). Since backpacker mobilities are located in specific geographies, there needs to be an investigation as to any ‘uneven geographies of oppression’ which are ‘evident in people’s differential abilities to move’ (Cresswell, 2006, 741-2.), a question of ‘how mobilities get produced both materially and in terms of ideas, who moves, how they move, how to particular forms of mobility become meaningful. What other movements are enabled or constrained in this process? Who benefits from this movement?’ (Cresswell, 2001a: 25) and who is it produced in relation to and at who’s expense? This chapter also
looks specifically at the politics of mobility, since politics is about power, ideology, and control over people, ideas and behaviour.

In Chapter four, the ‘Research Methodology’ chapter, I take a journey with backpackers, partly as a result of a ‘mobility turn’ spreading into and transforming the social sciences, where researchers have drawn upon theories of mobility, embodiment, performance, materiality and practice in an attempt to provide increasingly nuanced understandings of the ways in which people more or less consciously and creatively inhabit and move through particular kinds of spaces, environments, places and landscapes, linking ‘individual agency, social action and the imposition of meaning upon worlds of experience’ (Throop and Murphy, 2002: 199) and cultural patterning of subjective experience. The New Mobilities paradigm (NMP) seeks to rethink and move beyond the idea of a bounded ethnographic field to address the issues associated with belonging to a mobile world where ‘people are travelling further and faster’ (Urry, 2007: 4), where displacements are increasingly temporary rather than permanent. Today’s maxim for the social scientist is ‘follow the actors themselves’ (Latour, 2005: 12) in order to learn from them ‘what the collective existence has become in their hands, what methods they have elaborated to make it fit together’ (ibid, 12). Backpackers are not passive products of their social world, mere ‘cultural dupes’, but active producers in a world that extends over national, cultural, political boundaries to all corners of the globe. The objective of this chapter addresses the need to follow the actor’s own ways by grasping their reality, joining them so as to meld practice with theory, multiple methods making the phenomena more alive, more real and more immediate. Following my academic journey through field research to writing up, I argue for a multi-paradigmatic approach and the researcher as ‘bricoleur’ because of the complexity of the world and the lived experiences being investigated. This strategy elaborated my ‘vulgar competence’ with this phenomenon, multiple methods of data collection enabling a bricolage which evolving to use and extend Pierre Bourdieu and his theory of practice (chapters five through nine) in an open ended and evolving process.

Chapter five, entitled ‘Travellerscapes and the Field’, links meaningful movement with discursively produced and socially constructed symbolic and material landscapes of mobility and practice, which subject the spatialised and socialised bodies to the dynamics of globalisation. I argue that drifters and their tactical maneuverings in ‘free space’ brought countercultural values, ideas, concepts, plans, beliefs and objects on the road east, the exercise of the imagination creating a powerful travelling culture and shaping social and
material space by which they and those that followed them could orient themselves, their subjectivity, institutions and practices taking very public and visible form. The emergence of networks of mobility such as the ‘hippie trail’ aided the spread of ‘drifting’ globally, before this very visibility saw them labeled deviant. This chapter initially maps out the demarcated space through which ‘drifters’ realised particular goals, a space I call ‘travellerscapes’, based on Arun Appadurai’s (1996) five dimensions of global cultural flow, the building blocks of imagined worlds, which pattern flows and movements by distributing, placing and connecting backpackers by establishing series of routes, relays, enclaves and access points across time and space. These landscapes are neither objective nor subjective; inter-twining, until version of self and world can emerge, shaping landscapes that delay a global belonging, ‘a synthetic space, a man-made system of spaces superimposed on the face of the land functioning and evolving not according to natural laws but to serve a community’ (Jackson, 1984: 8), where movement bounded within a social, spatial and temporal system of opportunities and constraints, invoked through complex travel and countercultural discourses.

Their spatial movement, voluntary and flexible, I will argue is made to fit a fluid, yet broadly structured and coherent travel environment, a reality ‘within which their identifications, identities, and investments are mutually constituted’ (Grossberg, 1992: 106). Without necessarily ‘belonging’ to the places where, for the moment, they are traversing, these scapes continue to be practiced and performed into being, acting as a social arena (medium rather than a container) and form the basis for social action, where routines of everyday life can be lost, (without the socialising boundaries of the school, university, church or factory) and a new identity internalised. Containing ‘specific forms and trajectories of movement’, inhabited by reflexive modern subjects, who are ‘on the move’ (Urry, 1995), these landscapes rather than hidden, are celebrated in movies and literature, recast as a world apart in a global framework, an imagined world (community) were empowered actors gain presence and emerge as modern subjects. For those who can access and participate in this world, they operate within demarcated spaces carved out through a disjuncture in a global cultural economy, mapped and structured over time, offering a ‘being-in-the-world’ with social, temporal and spatial dimensions, mobility sold as a vehicle for inner development and transformative articulation. I describe the production and maintenance of this global imagined world, a world that facilitates the circulation and exchange of a cultural identity, exploring how these landscapes are produced, lived
experiences and argue that, rather than being tightly territorialised, spatially bounded or culturally homogeneous, they can be seen as a ‘field’ (Bourdieu, 1977).

Chapter six, called ‘Mobility Systems and Spaces of Consumption’, outlines how spatial movement doesn’t happen in a vacuum, backpacker mobilities and narrative making inscribed onto the land as tangible, physical and material reality, facilitating mobility systems and social spaces that enable travellers to weave events, places and peoples together. Mobility is never detachable from fixity, ‘global infrastructures’ (Graham and Marvin, 2001), ‘spatio-temporal fixes’ (Jessop, 2006), ‘moorings’ (Urry, 2007), fixities, objects and the immobility of others, all of which are required for backpacking to happen. Just as motorscapes do not endure without petrol stations and roads, the travellerscapes do not endure by themselves as backpackers revealingly run through spaces, ‘weaving their own space-time trajectories’ (Murdock, 2006: 97), its discourses, conventions and logic pressed into and through materialities, social spaces and systems that manage not only spatial mobility but the mobility of ideas, capital and objects. Rather than focus on movement in space-time, ‘the interaction between actors, structures, and context’ (Kaufmann et al, 2004: 749), enable people to make sense out of their reality, using material objects and infrastructure so as to locate it, bound it and shape it into meaningful forms.

I draw upon the development of the drifter ‘overland scene’, their ‘countercultural’ way of seeing and doing achieving consistency by intervening in social space and its production, both creating and appropriating systems and spaces, through which they could cope with distance. From the socio-spatial infrastructures such as freak hotels, freak buses, cafes and record stores, these systems and spaces became the backbone to this world, where co-presence, narrative, exchange of ideas, goods and knowledge could be exchanged and discourses acted upon. From hostels to backpacker transport, mobility systems and spaces of consumption become places of socialisation and identity formation where symbolic exchanges create collective belief, their very existence affirming the existence of the scapes. As backpacker movement in geographic space is now translated into institutional support, enclaves and natural and man-made stagings, this chapter also explores how multinational corporations are increasingly making the scapes more legible, reducible and understandable in terms of settings and stagings for people with a short amount of time to orientate themselves creating what some consider ‘stylised landscapes’, where the law of the ‘proper’ (de Certeau, 1988) rules.
Chapter seven, called ‘Habitus and the Performance of Backpacking’, examines how at the conjuncture of subjective vision and objective conditions, Bourdieu's concept of habitus can be applied as a secondary socialisation, a (western) backpacker habitus emerging not within a relatively bounded locality but through embodied and perceptual engagement with the scapes. I argue the scapes (or field) require its participants to get a feel for the ‘game’, requiring competencies, skills, knowledge and the capacity to move both socially, temporally and spatially the ‘right’ way. Enabled by the bricoalge, I extend Bourdieu’s concept of habitus, along with the related concepts of field and capital to account for the durable, transposable dispositions of being, seeing, acting and thinking that backpackers, once socialised can possess. To become a backpacker always involves a ‘being with’ or around others, where been mobile with other people mobilises a series of relational practices that are enacted in order to be seen as a backpacker (ust as a myriad of diverse practices are enacted in order to become a car or airline passenger). While early readings characterised the habitus as a fate or destiny, I argue this secondary socialisation sees collectively held patterns of thinking and acting, an embodied reality, which over time can become strongly held dispositions of the mind and body; a practical logic and a way of seeing and doing. I argue the habitus interacts with the field (scapes) for the acquisition of (sub)cultural capital in the pursuit of distinction, as backpackers concern themselves with the preservation or improvement of their positions with respect to the defining value of that capital.

In Chapter eight, ‘Landscapes of Power: Performing the Habitus’, I show how the scapes have unleashed and accelerated various touristic mobilities that change our understanding of backpacking, ‘fields of power’ such as the judiciary, academia, industry and government extending the label backpacker into positions that reposition ‘traditional’ backpackers into a less dominant position in the scapes, reframing the world and its practices as something that can be modeled and valued, often in economic, safety and market terms. I argue that the scapes can be materially, discursively and symbolically altered, as high status actors seek to impose relatively firm boundaries and coherence on the scapes, privileging mechanisms for producing and reproducing structured mobile positions (study backpackers, gap year students, flashpackers, working holiday makers) that are capital (economic, cultural) rich and visa compliant, a ‘structural coherence’ (Harvey, 1985) enabling and reproducing a vibrant and profitable backpacker industry. While such coherence occurs to a large extent in the public realm of consumption and self-
fashioning by backpackers themselves, I argue partial control has passed to autonomous political, economic, and cultural forces that interact through a market ideology to produce landscapes encoded with clear visual cues and codes (Edensor, 2001), potentially ‘over inscribing’ and ‘over determining’ the scapes with meaning. However, I argue that those backpackers with a tactical stance use embodied (sub)cultural capital to explore their position in the scapes, causing partial revolutions, the development and popularity of Couchsurfing.com, a social networking site that facilitates social relations between individuals, enabling individuals to explicitly act to refashion their identities and further their position in the scapes by regulating their bodies, their thoughts and their conduct in new participatory ways. I will argue that such ‘technologies of the self’ (Foucault, 1988; O’Regan, 2009) can change the rules of a complex social and cultural game, reconfiguring corporeal travel practices and mobility itself, providing new opportunities for identity expression, sociality and meetingness, providing access to resources that might be experienced as personalised, authentic, capital intensive and identity-enhancing as the home itself becomes a space in which the field is felt, bringing into focus certain dispositional traces internalised through mobility and intensive socialisation.

Chapter Nine, ‘A situated and partial bricolage’, summarises the arguments and discussions presented in the bricolage, focusing primarily on the habitus and scapes, as well as addressing important and pertinent issues such as the contribution to knowledge. The concept of the bricolage, which enabled me to produce new knowledge, is also used to suggest new research as well as political and management action.

1.6 Chapter Summary.

Harvey argues that since the 1970’s, we have been experiencing an intense phase of time-space compression, creating a ‘challenging, exciting, stressful, and sometimes deeply troubling’ world (Harvey, 1989: 240), that has had a ‘a disorienting and disruptive impact upon political-economic practices, the balance of class power, as well as upon cultural and social life’ (Harvey, 1989: 284). Mobility, in its current scope and scale is central to this process, as social relations and identities increasingly form through movement, where differential mobilities reflect tendencies in postmodern society. When analysing mobility discourses, the central tendency is one of polarisation, between those who have the means to be mobile or who can control their mobility and those who are immobile or negatively impacted by the mobility of others. As spatial-temporal resources are built into individual life
projects, sustaining and generating new or recycling global flows, few individuals are fully in control of their mobility, many of the world’s population ‘forbidden, regulated, policed and prevented’ (Cresswell, 2006: 735) from movement or are conditioned by movement, their escape not facilitating global hotel chains, commuter infrastructure and airports but refugee camps, detention centers and squatter settlements. Only for a minority, does the world appear to be more mobile, their ‘ways of knowing the world have also become more fluid’ (Cresswell, 2006: 45), making mobility a near precondition for social life as well as a derived product of it, all of which possibly might not just change the world but may change the ways of knowing it and talking about it.

Categories and metaphors related to mobility such as motility, nomadism, displacement, movement, transition, transience, fluidity, dislocation, travelling, tourism, world-travelling, border-crossings are multiplying; the NMP helping to make spatial movements more visible, modernity providing for more spatialised and socialised actors, where movements in time-space can offer a deeper transformation and an arena to reflexively develop, enabling individuals to ‘define themselves according to personal experiences of the world’ (Desforges, 1998: 189). Increased attention over the past decade has enhanced understanding of many specific forms of temporary movement spanning categories such as the refugee, student, business person, knowledge worker, immigrant, seasonal worker, migrant, displayed person, exile and asylum seeker, but the mobility ascribed to the tourist is seen as privileged, intense but fleeting, their mobility ‘through an internal landscape which is sculptured by personal experience and cultural influences’ (Rojek, 1997: 53), seen as less worthy of investigation, their lived experiences often associated with spectacle and sensation rather than meaning (Rojek, 1993), even though in a more fluid, globalising world, few moves are now as truly ‘permanent’ (Bell and Ward, 2000). There has been relatively little investigation of imagined worlds (communities) that invoke ‘tourism’ or sustain tourism related mobilities, the neglect according to Lash and Urry (1994: 254) stemming from certain academic prejudices: ‘of analysing manufacturing rather than services … of ‘work’ rather than ‘leisure’, of structure rather than mobility, and of work-related mobility rather than leisure mobility’ and while progress has been made in identifying connections between different forms of mobility, the movement and research of tourists have been static and linear. Metaphors and macro-descriptors relating to travel and tourism rarely do justice to the multiple ‘lived mobilities’ of late modernity, the ‘imagination as a constitutive feature of modern subjectivity’ (Appadurai, 1996: 3) ushering in many open and fluid social identities (Urry, 1995) as individuals with greater individual freedoms
and capacity for discursive judgment imagine themselves as members of various imagined worlds that can be accessed by self-induced and self-controlled mobility.

While certain forms of social and cultural identity and identification are still imagined through a sense of belonging to socially and culturally territorially bounded and stable places, such as the home or the nation state, others seek identification with (global) imagined worlds (communities), where images and information about faraway worlds, as well as myths and historical memory (re)produce cultural flows and transnational socio-spatial practices. These individuals learn to consume and perform in deterritorialised terrains, and find meaning in movement, which constitutes their actual lived experience in their day-to-day interactions within a fluid, lived, material, social, and (im)material environment. From sportscapes, queerscapes to the rural landscapes, spatial mobility in its various forms provides a lens through which to view the touristic mobility and indeed daily lives generated from various worlds. A more fluid and increasingly interconnected world is revealing many new forms of global belonging, sustaining mobilities where distinctions depend on modes and forms of movement, the character of those who are moving, the places one moves through or moves to and so on (Urry, 2007), taxonomies, typologies and classifications telling us virtually nothing about how these worlds operate. One such world is backpacking, a world endowed with its own history, discourses, desires, historical memory and intentions, creating a distinct type and form of tourism, with a 'memory of its own' (Bourdieu, 1991), one that has been successfully transmitted and recycled for nearly sixty years, their predecessors, the drifters ‘conceptualising space, mobility and access in a more socially imaginative way’ (Massey, 1993: 63), ‘a way of inhabiting and apprehending’ (Pons, 2003: 62), their movement (like other forms of tourism) seemingly a pivotal characteristic ‘of dwelling and practicing the world’ (Pons, 2003: 62).

I argue that a (transnational) countercultural imagination emerged during a period of flux in the 1960’s through a disjuncture in a global cultural economy, creating various imagined worlds that spread over vast and irregular spaces. One geographic imaginary and mobility fantasy about free uncontaminated space became a social field, entering into the fabrication of social lives of many people in many societies (Appadurai, 1990: 198), the road east promoted as a world better than the one experienced in the west, a world that could subvert the imagined worlds of the official mind. Opening up the possibility for a better life, this world was performed into being by those who wanted to remove their marginality, the journey and the accumulation of embodied and objectified ‘capital’ creating
a world that was delocalised and transnational. Today, mobility still gives this world a recognisable coherence, contributing to a world that offers particular forms of seeing, encounter, togetherness and sociality, mobilities mapped onto alternative spaces and material settings along networks of mobility as individuals weave places together. Their mobility and mobility related practices make this world visible, bringing it into material and social reality, producing ‘knowledges, stories, traditions, comportments, music, books, diaries… and other cultural expressions’ (Clifford, 1992: 108), a discursive field that supports a distinct way-of being-in-the-world. Emerging through reflexive choice, a commitment to ‘inhabit’ a particular kind of space and have a particular relationship with that space, they inter-subjectively articulate this world with others, in the hope that by creating shared frameworks, their common experience will contain a life-world that can offer a sense of place. Performative / geographic imaginaries when stressed upon landscapes of mobility and practice have become an embodied reality for many, whose lived geographies are internalised individually and collectively; movement through imaginary and lived landscapes the underlying principle that animates their life-world that is either here or there, making possible a new way of approaching life, an existential trajectory of being and becoming; ‘routes rather than roots become a defining feature of social life, identity-making and cultural belonging’ (Aas, 2007: 285).
Chapter Two: From Counterculture to Backpacking: Re-mapping Budget Independent Travel.
2.1 Introduction.

It would be tempting to start with a tidy and convenient narrative about backpacking as an ‘alternative’ form / type of tourism, but as individuals generate a distinct way of ‘being-in-the-world’ by participating in an imagined world (community), I argue they take up a role in relation to movement, their imaging of landscapes as much imaginary as real. It is a world with fluid, irregular boundaries; landscapes of mobility and practice that I argue can potentially erode the boundary-setting capacities of the nation-state, not only at an ephemeral level but at a deeper felt level as they move through and with this world. I have argued that identification with this world generates and demands mobility as participants seek exposure to the peoples, cultures and places socially constructed as meaningful within this world, and thought the encounters and engagements that mobility yields, the individual becoming one with the world to which they have invested physically, economically, spatially and mentally. However, as a label or category, ‘backpacker’ and ‘backpacking’ used to describe this world and those who position themselves in it can generate a surprising amount of emotional debate. From the scholars who contest the conflicting claims to its origin, the entrepreneurs who seek to extend it as a label, the filmmakers who use them and their practices as a plot device to the backpackers who wish to distance themselves from it, there is little agreement as to the nature of backpacking homogeneity or heterogeneity. Backpackers, for example have become described with a plethora of sociological labeling such as ‘community’ (Welk, 2004), ‘subculture’ (Murphy, 2001; Shaffer, 2004; Westerhausen, 2002) and ‘neo-tribe’ (Wilson and Richards, 2004).

There has also been some discursive association to earlier form and type of travel like the ‘Grand Tour’, ‘Tramping’ and the ‘Wandervogel’, historical antecedents I argue, lacking any degree of symbolic, cultural, structural or historic continuity with backpacking.

This chapter seeks to trace backpacking development from a ‘countercultural imagination’\(^3\), which emerged from a period that stretches to the early forties, but is primarily associated with the period, 1966-1972 when tens of thousands of young men and women abandoned the centre of their societies for an alternative way of life we call the counterculture. Specifically, I note the importance of the period between 1965 and 1975, when a ‘drift east’ saw thousands of young men and women journey from western societies to the far east (India, Nepal, Indonesia), the so called ‘free space’ revealing their subjective priorities and break with inherited identities. Providing an opportunity to release their subjectivity, the drift

\(^3\) This imagination was described by Abbie Hoffman in his 1969 trial; as ‘[t]he state of mind. It’s a nation of alienated young people which we carry around in our minds just as the Sioux Indians carried around the Sioux Nation in their minds’ (Fischer, 2006: 302).
drew a heterogeneous population united in their opposition to the processes of perceived exclusion in western society. I argue this drift soon gave birth to the ‘drifters’ (Cohen, 1973) and an overland scene of cafes, ‘freak hotels’, ‘freak buses’ and alternative guidebooks as individuals ‘doing their own thing’ marked objects, places and events of significance with a countercultural way of seeing and doing. Gradually giving way to tribal bonding and a mapped, visible and patterned travel style, they produced a rationale for a form / type of travel style that didn’t exist within normative understandings of tourism, the ‘drift’ east created or is associated with many of the spaces, routes, conventions, stakes, values, truths and regularities of backpacking, a identifier that came to replace drifting in the 1980’s and 1990’s as the countercultural imagination reignited (Stephens, 1998), their worlds, stories and pictures represented in literature, art, film, and theatre providing individuals with clues to the shape, boundaries and meaning of newly imagined worlds they inhabit.

2.2. The Counterculture.

The label ‘backpacker’ didn’t originate in 1990 when first noted at an academic conference by Pearce (1990), since it was already an internal-external dialectic of identification (Jenkins, 1996) since the early 1980’s. It’s usage however; rose with the renewed popularity of budget independent travel in the early-1990s, research often hiding or obscuring an understanding of how this travelling culture and a successful travel style emerged. Early backpacking research associated backpacking with the upper class travellers of the Grand Tour (Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995; Murphy, 2005; O’ Reilly, 2005; Shaffer, 2004), 19th century western romanticists, tramping4 (Adler, 1985), German Youth Movements such as the Wandervogel5 (Desforges, 1998; cf. Becker, 1946) as well as itinerant marginal economic groups such as the hobos and tramps. While these frequently used antecedents offer a quick analysis, they lack any clear identification with backpacking, their relationship often ill defined or charted. Indeed, backpacking could just as easily be associated with medieval European pilgrims, colonial explorers, the peripatetic’s, flaneur explores or missionaries with Löfgren (2002: 7) cautioning against the sort of catch-all narrative that ‘fall[s] into evolutionary or devolutionary traps, like ‘from the Grand Tour to Europe on $5 a day’.

While the most prevalent association has been made with the Grand Tour, since it is during

---

4 Trampling was an eighteenth and nineteenth century religious or labour-related travel practice
5 The Wandervogel, meaning a magical bird, was a pre-world-war-one German youth movement noted for their love of the land, walking, hiking and skiing. Rather than inclusive, it operated according to a strong nationalism that excluded non-Germans and Jews.
this period that those with privilege and power began to prize mobility and regard it as a right (Kaplan, 2006), the Grand Tour was considered a necessary part of one’s higher education, a near obligation for Europe’s privileged, gilded youth and ‘part of the necessary finishing for the commercial, political and artistic elite’ (Franklin, 2004: 288). This rite of passage treated travel on the European Continent as ‘graduation to a higher form’ (Gailhard, 1678: 23), with books of the time advising parents to request regular written evaluations from their children’s tutors (Adler, 1989). It can be considered as a form of travel born not out of free choice and autonomy but an obligation and duty. While the Grand Tour dominates discursive representations of early tourism and travel, there is a need to reconsider and re-anchor backpacking, investigating the major historical, social, cultural events leading up its affordance as an affective, accessible world. Irreducible to an obligation (Grand Tour), nationalism (Wangervogel) or coercion (vagabonds), I argue that backpacking is most closely aligned with countercultural imagination and ‘drifting’, which emerged out of a disjunction and a period of societal flux we call the counterculture, creating a world endowed with its own logic, conventions, truths and norms, generating infrastructure, products, images, myths and history. While there is no tidy seminal moment when drifting was born, it evolved into an organised social field of struggle in the late 1960’s and defined the biographies of thousands enabling them to move beyond the confines of territorial boundaries and identities.

There is considerable debate as to when the counterculture began as a cultural construct with most commentators placing it between 1960 and 1970. Marwick (1999) places it between 1958 and 1974 while Roszak (1995) places the ‘sixties’ ‘within a broader setting that stretches from 1942 to 1972’ starting with the Beats who sought mobility and ‘wild experiences to escape from the predictability of suburban life’ (Ziguras, 2001). Emerging out of the ‘hipsters’ who formed around Black jazz and swing performers, a Bohemian counterculture began to evolve around North Beach in San Francisco in the early fifties, the home of the San Francisco Literary Renaissance. A scene was forged around poets and writers such as Lawrence Ferlinghetti and Gary Snyder, a scene that soon embraced leading New York Beat personalities such as Allen Ginsberg and Jack Kerouac. Labeled Beatniks by San Francisco Chronicle columnist Herb Caen in 1958, the Beat culture

6 Leed (1991: 14) notes that ‘the history of travel is in crucial ways a history of the West. It recounts the evolution from necessity to freedom, an evolution that gave rise to a new consciousness, the peculiar mentality of the modern traveler’.
7 Swartz (1999) outlined three meanings of the word beat: (1) as a marker of musical rhythm (particularly the beat of jazz), (2) in the sense of people ‘being broken, beaten down, pushed to the margins of existence by a cruel and hostile world’ (Swartz, 1999: 11) and (3) a religious experience or form.
8 Known for his counter-cultural essays, Norman Mailer wrote the essay ‘The White Negro’ (1957) to defend the moral radicalism of the outsider and hipster in 1920-1950’s America (http://www.dissentmagazine.org/online.php?id=26).
evolved around Grant Avenue, Green Street and Broadway in San Francisco where its salons, art galleries, bars and restaurants were transformed into the epicenter of the Beat community. Known as ‘the Beach’ or ‘the scene’ (Lawlor, 2005), the area, its writers, personalities and art attracted young single men who were rejecting a home-centered lifestyle to be geographically mobile, their vision involving the ‘pursuit of sexual, spiritual, and political liberation’ (Swartz, 1999: 20) and became a resistance movement against a society they saw ‘based on lies, deceit, imperialism, commercialism, racism, and sexism’ (ibid, 28). The label beatnik soon expanded to include all the alienated hip-youth of the post World War Two before hippies became dominant⁹ (Cresswell, 1993; McDowell, 1994).

Ziguras (2001) argues the Beats were drawn together ‘by their desire to elude the mainstream and to avoid angst by resorting to hyper-mobility’, often looking to music, literature, art and alternative religions to provide deeper meaning and inspiration as new ideas, objects and knowledge started to flow around the globe through new electronic media, literature and poetry. The area around North Beach became an arena in which norms and expectations could be challenged, but as rental prices rose in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s, the Beach ‘was becoming overrun with poseurs and tourists’ with tourists taking bus tours to North Beach where they could buy ‘beatnik kits’ (Lawlor, 2005: 311). It forced the remnants of this world and its lifestyle adherents to move to Haight-Ashbury, a neighborhood in San Francisco near Golden Gate Park. A new ‘scene’ (Irwin, 1977) developed, attracting the white, middle-class and in many cases college-educated who were reacting to a loss an overriding societal purpose. Fueled by increased leisure time, societal affluence and the rapid postwar participation in the university system, they sought escape - both literally and metaphorically (Miles, 2008) as previous temporal rhythms governing study, graduation and employment were shattering, suspended and replaced by a developing ‘socio-political-cultural concept’ (Stephens, 1998: 12) known as the counterculture. This world was more expressive, its more confident and affluent inhabitants entertaining activities that were more self-conscious, more articulate and more middle class than the literary and artistic beats. Rather than move within small circles, these hippies¹⁰ sought to turn people on in terms of aesthetics, politics, social beliefs and structures, the move to Haight-Ashbury now accredited as the birthplace of the hippies and the

---

⁹ Depastino (2003) argues the Beats ‘would eventually emerge as the most important counterculture in postwar America until they upheavals of the 1960s’ (p. 235). Noting how the Hippies were ‘inspired by Kerouac’s vision of perfect freedom’ (p. 240).

¹⁰ The label ‘hippies’ was coined by Michael Fallon, a reporter for the San Francisco Examiner in a 1965 story about the new bohemian lifestyle that was developing in the district. Fallon got the name by shortening Norman Mailer’s term hipster, applying it to the second generation of beatniks and the amalgam of alternative middle-class youth cultures that had moved into the Haight from nearby North Beach because of the cheaper rents (Lawlor, 2005). Generally, hippies did not fully accept the label, but put no special stock in it, saying, ‘[h]ippie? What’s that? I’m a free man, or as free as you can be in our society’ (McGrath, 1970: 170).
countercultural imagination (Gair, 2007).

For these primarily young people, the Haight was a ‘literal’ escape from the consumerist suburban lifestyle, while metaphorically it was an escape from America (Miles, 2008: 75-76). During 1967, fifteen thousand people converged in the area for the ‘Gathering of Tribes for the Human Be-in’, a prelude to the summer of Love: the period of free concerts, anti-Vietnam war protests, street theatre, communes, marijuana and psychedelic drugs. The district, which had an estimated 800 hippies in residence in 1965, had 15,000 by 1966, increasing to 100,000 during the summer of 1967 (Falk and Falk, 2005). This was the zenith of the counterculture, when Leary in his first appearance in San Francisco offered his gospel: ‘Turn on, tune in, drop out’11. By the mid-1960’s, this countercultural imagination was driven by the idea of taking back places, making them ‘translocal’, ‘flowering’ cities and creating alternative structures and enclaves where networked individuals and groups of similarly-thinking people could coalesce. Primarily located in urban centres across America and western Europe, they attracted geographically dispersed individuals, who through ad hoc communal centres, co-ops, crash pads developed a scene where new ‘drop outs’ could find accommodation, companionship, food and advice. When Time magazine published ‘The Hippies: the Philosophy of a Subculture’12 in July 1967, they noted that ‘hippie enclaves are blooming in every major U.S. city from Boston to Seattle, from Detroit to New Orleans: there is a 50-member cabal in, of all places, Austin, Texas’. By the end of the 1960’s, the ‘intense, spontaneous internationalism’ (Neville, 1970: 14) saw enclaves across America and Europe develop, stretching from the Haight-Ashbury district (San Francisco), Sunset Strip (Los Angeles), the East Village (New York), Ladbroke Grove, Notting Hill and Piccadilly (London), around the Blue Mosque (Istanbul) to Dam Square (Amsterdam) and St. Marks in Venice (Lewis, 1972; Mills, 1973; Neville, 1970).

These districts and streets became nodes in a countercultural landscape as images, ideas, music, people and information carried back and forth across the world. There was an ‘instructive’ relationship between movement and belonging in so far as movement to these enclaves connected bodies to other bodies, attachment taking place ‘through being moved by others’ (Ahmed, 2004: 1). For many young people who uprooted themselves to travel to these deterritorialised enclaves, they combined physicality, praxis and temporality, the move transforming individual subjectivity and relationships, providing for what Tom

11 ‘Turn on, tune in, drop out’ was a counterculture phrase coined by Timothy Leary in a speech during 1966.
12 http://www.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19670707,00.html
Hayden called as a ‘re-assertion of the personal’ (Cavallo, 2001: 76) and a basis for individuals to set new goals and embark on an alternative life trajectory. For a short period, especially in the United States, this world was successful as individuals sought to set up their own economic, cultural, and even political structures (alternative bookstores, pirate radio stations, food and clothing co-ops, underground magazines, health food stores and medical centres) and used pro-social public space that supported sharing and interaction (in libraries, art galleries, museums, gardens, parks and other shared spaces). Even though Time Magazine estimated there were only 300,000 hippies in 1967, by 1968, the coherence of the scene attracted young people, onlookers and even tourists, each major American city containing at least one alternative publication and/or radio station. In the United Kingdom, magazines like OZ, International Times and Friends (latterly Frendz) debated ideology, announced demonstrations, reviewed albums, concerts and books, sharing the countercultural way of seeing and doing with readers (Rycroft, 2003), providing a world that individuals could relate to, aspire to and even inhabit. Mobility facilitated exchange and a ‘gut solidarity; sharing common aspirations, inspirations, strategy, style, mood and vocabulary’ (Neville, 1970: 14).

By 1967, the ‘the first flush of hippiedom was on the wane’ (Neville, 1970: 31) as ‘hippie’ enclaves were overflowing with tourists, reporters, underage runaways, undercover police, hard drugs, musicians, poets, dropouts, junkies, profiteers, hustlers, students and violent criminals (Lewis, 1972; Schneider, 2008), the Haight-Ashbury, once the ‘the Capital of the Hippies’ (Thompson, 1967) now where ‘the social hemorrhaging was showing up’ (Didion, 1968/1995: 213). The utopian myth got very real as attempts to create a psychedelic community collapsed with problems of drug abuse, poverty, murder, prostitution, criminality and homelessness emerging in the Haight. Hunter S. Thompson wrote the ‘[t]he language was Love,’ ‘but the style was paranoia’ (Pendergast and Pendergast, 2000: 338) as alternative ways of seeing, belonging, knowing and producing became unsustainable in a bounded geographic area, their ‘won space’ (Hall and Jefferson, 1976) locked into an spatial grid to which society was in no mood to acquiesce. From the slights of ‘shop
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13 Thomas Emmet Hayden (born December 11, 1939) is an American social and political activist and politician, most noted for his involvement in the anti-war and civil rights movements of the 1960s.
14 By 1967, cafés in San Francisco gave free coffee to hippies to sit at their tables as a way to attract tourists while Grey line tours offered a ‘safari through psychedelphia’ (Anthony, 1980) as six-dollar ‘Hippie Hop Tour’ to the Haight-Ashbury district.
15 Rycroft (2003) notes the transnational dialogue facilitated by the development of the Underground Press Syndicate, and through the mobility of key personnel, figures and groups during the counterculture.
16 Mitchell (1967) wrote ‘as a result the tone of Haight-Ashbury changed. With many people coming in expecting to be fed and housed, the older community tried to fulfill their needs. Rather than asking them to do their thing, the community tried to give them what they came for. The community tried to be something it wasn’t’ (Russell, 1999: 74).
assistants, landladies and tax-drivers. (Miles, 1973), judicial, journalistic and political representations turning the enclaves into a dangerous and deviant underworld. On October 6, 1967, in San Fransisco, a march led by the Diggers called ‘Death of Hippie: Son [sic] of Media’ with a cardboard coffin and filled with the remnants of beads and beards, prophesying the end of the Haight (Wolfe, 1968/1999). Miles (1973: 196) describes how ‘[w]hen young people slept in the parks the parks were closed, so they walked the streets: when they walked the streets they were moved on: when moved on they had to steal to find money for accommodation’. He argues the western societies at that time wouldn’t provide material systems or organise spaces for the hippies but instead sought to control, regulate and eliminate them. Rather than provide a basis for this world to develop, individuals who participated were cleared from the streets, parks and any place they sought to congregate. Those encamped in Dam Square (Amsterdam), called the ‘dustbin of European Youth’ by the press were forcefully cleared. Political and regulatory powers evicted individuals from squats, refused them festival licenses and harassed the alternative press (Hoffman, 1968). The countercultural leaders resorted to ‘mobile tactics’ (Farber, 1988: 20-22) as they ‘walked away’ from politics and the enclaves to ‘live free’ (Miles, 2008; Neville, 1970; Turner, 2006), their refusal to conform, be subordinated or be appropriated meaning spatial movement became generative of meaning. The ‘Haight is love’ (Neville, 1970) spirit, energy and values fanned out from San Francisco taking its logic to the rest of the country through concerts, vehicles, communes, fashion, zines, literature and visual arts such as album covers. Reflecting ‘desires to achieve autonomy through self-exploration and direct action’ (Cavallo, 2001: 88), ‘dropping out’ now meant travel and was used to maintain a ‘coherency of identity’ (Desforges, 1998: 190) and a sense of self-fulfillment (Giddens, 1991). Mobility became a means to discover one’s singularity, ‘a commitment to mobility, choice, and change’ rather than a life of stability, sedentary and ‘settling for less’ (Leary, 1983: 253). Moving beyond known or acceptable ‘boundaries’ assumed a new importance, ‘the initiative to move, act directly and travel beyond the familiar, the routine, the expectable’ (Cavallo, 2001: 68) highlighting how ‘[u]topian desire doesn’t go away …. in fact never really went away’ (McKay, 1996: 6). Jerry Rubin in 1967 argued that: ‘[i]
support everything which puts people into motion, . . . which creates chaos and rebirth . . . faky, crazy, irrational, sexy, angry, irreligious, childish, mad people21.

Becoming a productive context for subjectivities, the countercultural imagination could not be understood as localised in any site-specific sense as the countercultural way of seeing began to be replayed and recycled on a global scale, as various events, objects and places helped different groups instruct, maintain and express their ‘countercultural’ sense of the world22. Roszak (1969: 240) argues the primary project of the countercultural imagination was to ‘proclaim a new heaven and a new earth so vast, so marvelous that the inordinate claims of technical expertise must of necessity withdraw in the presence of such splendor to a subordinate and marginal status in the lives of men. To create and broadcast such a consciousness of life entails nothing less than the willingness to open ourselves to the visionary imagination on its own demanding terms23. One such imagined world that formed when moving images, information and texts about ‘free space’ met deterritorialized, uprooted viewers (Appadurau, 1996) was that of the ‘east’, a world along with the back to the land movement that became a means to sustain the transformation they felt they had experienced. Tomory (1996) notes the words of Lieschen Muller: ‘you either stayed home and got into politics, the French revolution of ’68, the Vietnam demonstrations, Red Rudi Dutschke in Berlin, or you went East. A lot of people stayed for the politics, got disillusioned and then went East, because things hadn’t changed overnight as expected’. The drifters did not attempt to avoid global modernity per se, rather, but attempted to create a space for themselves within global culture on their own terms. The counterculture was never defined by geography, drawing dispersed participants from all over the country to enclaves, and once the enclaves collapsed, their energies and loyalties toward their community was as much defined as retaining attachment and belonging through mobility. The imagination was ‘projected outward through the consumption of space’ (Andrejevic, 2003: 135), mobility constituting an alternative way of seeing transposed and by virtue of some level of spatial, social and temporal freedom in ‘free-space’. The ‘east’ became another ‘metaphorical frontier, an image of new possibilities derived from drugs, sexual freedom, and a vague

21 Norman Mailer wrote the essay ‘The White Negro’ (1957) (http://www.dissentmagazine.org/online.php?id=26) that “[m]ovement is always to be preferred to inaction. In motion a man has a chance, his body is warm, his instincts are quick, and when the crisis comes, whether of love or violence, he can make it, he can win, he can release a little more energy for himself since he hates himself a little less, he can make a little better nervous system, make it a little more possible to go again, to go faster next time and so make more and thus find more people with whom he can swing’.

22 Adams (2004) for example noted the intellectual connections between the Beats and La Onda, (a Mexican hippie type movement, meaning ‘The Wave’ or ‘The Vide’.

23 In 1972, the underground publication Frendz optimistically proclaimed, ‘if flower-power has gone to seed then germination must soon begin’ (McKay, 1996: 4).
spirituality’ (Denisoff and Romanowski, 1991: 169).

2.2.1 The Drift East.

The hippies took many of its values from the Beats who had taken up the idea of moving through a physically and psychologically American landscapes that supported their image of another America since the 1950’s – inaugurating a new form of travel narrative about ‘driving across the nation’s expanding network of interstate highways and, ultimately, its southern frontier’ (Mexico) (Adams, 2004: 58), a narrative that drew a large number of like minded adherents in the mid to late 1950’s and early 1960’s. Their literature, art and poetry contained images and metaphors associated with freedom and travel, matched by the lifestyles of major Beat figures like Jack Kerouac, William Burroughs and Allen Ginsberg who were noted for their spur-of-the-moment road trips (Adams, 2004; Lawlor, 2005; Martinez, 2003) not simply across America but also Latin America, Morocco and Europe, when they felt their own cultures were ‘exhausted and drained of significance’ (Kaplan, 1996: 44-5). They conveyed an indication of mobility that was beyond, race, income and conventional reasons for movement (work, shopping, education) and while traditional identities were effectively structured around work and home, the Beats traced their resistance in alternative geographic imaginaries (Rycroft, 2003). Mobility became valued as a means to reawaken the soul, envisaging free spaces where they could both lose and find themselves again, Kerouac’s book ‘On the Road’ (1957) making ‘youth rebellion virtually synonymous with transcontinental travel’ (Adams, 2004).

Kerouac, Burroughs and Ginsberg found new frontiers in the cultures and peoples of Mexico, Morocco and especially India, their claim for alternative space and the appropriation of marginalised identities through mobility ‘rejecting ‘bourgeois vacuity, hegemonic surbanization, or even Cold War conformism’ (Martinez, 2003: 27). Beat writers and poets such as Peter Orlovsky, Gary Snyder and Allen Ginsberg travelled extensively in India and were central in drawing India and the East into the countercultural orbit (Roszak, 1969), their exploration of eastern religions, dress, music and traditions, drugs finding a willing audience in the west. Where America was sexually repressed, uptight, and overly rational, India was the land of unrepressed, spontaneous sexuality and cheap drugs (Roszak, 1969; Stephens, 1998; Turner, 2006; Urban, 2003). Just as the Beats had
‘consumed’ black Jazz musicians and people of colour (fellahin\textsuperscript{24}), the heads and freaks who had replaced the ‘Flower Power’ hippies increasingly purchased and consumed ‘the east’, just as they had incorporated tribal and native cultures (such as the American Native Indians) since the early 60’s (Hall, 1968, 1969; Lewis, 1970). The purchase of serapes, bells, beads, headbands, eastern philosophy and the music of Ravi Shankar, while smacking of distinct colonial imaginaries became central to the ‘eclectic orientalism of Hippie life’ (Hall, 1968) and by 1967-1968, celebrities and ‘countercultural’ figures such as Timothy Leary, the Beatles, Mike Love (of the Beach Boys), Mia Farrow and Donovan had visited India. These journeys formed a foundation for the drift east (Cresswell, 1993) and for the first time, long distance travel wasn’t a holiday, exploration or migration but a decision about your place in the world. As the baton moved from the Beats to the Hippies, ‘something wilder and weirder on out on the road’ (Wolfe, 1968: 103) was evolving. Once the enclaves had collapsed, the only way to shape global reality was through movement, India and the drift east now compatible with their global aspirations, and soon became a portal allowing entry into the wider world of international relations with like minded others.

By 1970, Richard Neville claimed that participating in the overland scene represented an individual’s ‘wholesale rejection’ of traditional society and politics, symbolising freedom and independence (Cavallo, 2001) but also enabling access into a world, which, in its globality gave meaning to individual existence in it, where through mobility and community attachment, an individual could lose and rediscover themselves bodily in a wild, native, welcoming, free and frugal landscape. Movement meant escape from restrictions, laws and obligations that sought to impose immobility. By applying entirely imaginative characteristics to movement, ‘both in a geographical sense of travelling, and in an existential sense’ (Brake, 1990: 100), it underpinned a particular geographical imaginary that replaced constructs such as borders and nations; replacing it with a newly constructed (countercultural) imaginative map of the world, ‘giving prominence to countries perceived to be spiritual and marginalized’ (Stephens, 1998: 52). Promoted extensively, especially in British countercultural publications such as ‘OZ’, this world was a way of challenging and criticising ‘the social and societal in places the travelers call home’ (Elssrud, 2004: 173), enabling individuals, niche media, countercultural leaders to draw new boundaries in a world where the old state and social structures were in the process of unraveling. Nicola

\textsuperscript{24} Holton (1995: 269) argues the Beats attempted to appropriate other cultures was a ‘naive vision’, their identification with heterogeneous marginalized cultures written within their literary output. In ‘On the Road’ (1957) after Sal and Dean travel to Mexico, Sal describes the poor people as ‘fellahin’ who inhabit the equatorial regions of the world.
Chiaromonte\(^{25}\) (1976: 64) challenged students in Paris during the 1968 revolt\(^{26}\) to adopt a ‘nonrhetorical form of ‘total rejection’, a call that resonated throughout the counterculture. He argued that individuals ‘must detach themselves, must become resolute ‘heretics.’ They must detach themselves quietly, without shouting or riots, indeed in silence and secrecy; not alone but in groups, in real ‘societies’ that will create, as far as possible, a life that is independent and wise … It would be … a non-rhetorical form of ‘total rejection’. As a fraternal brotherhood already ‘turned on’ by the journeys myths, stories, and fantasies headed east, enabled by globalisation and the movement of images, objects, persons, ideas and capital to temporarily submit to become part of a mobile collective. It is well to remember Lefebvre (1991a: 200) who argues that ‘space does not consist in the projection of an intellectual representation, does not arise from the visible-readable realm, but that it is first of all heard (listened to) and enacted (through physical gestures and movements)’.

### 2.2.2 Paradise Now: Drifting.

For the ‘heads’ and ‘freaks’ the experience of mobility, being on the road and moving east was a vehicle for transformation in space already manoeuvred in ‘aesthetically’ through books, clothes, stories, music, underground press and film. Rather than a means of overcoming distance, it was also a way of being of being in the world, being mobile with others in time-space ‘critical in both establishing and enhancing a sense of collective purpose and a common understanding’ (Brennan, 2004: 70). Brennan argues that rhythm is a tool in the expression of agency, just as words are and can unite word and affect, the urge for ‘togetherness’ a major characteristic of the counterculture (Hall, 1968). From the enclaves to Woodstock, sociality, proximity, movement and co-presence enabled them to feel they were part of something bigger\(^{27}\). The drift east offered alternative possibilities and had an exploratory nature, since there were no mass-produced maps, infrastructure or an enabling tourism industry, relying on their gut solidarity and countercultural way of seeing, serving as base ‘from which relations within an eternity composed of targets or threats ….can be managed’ (de Certeau, 1988: 36).

Like Shields (1991) ‘social spatialisation’, which he describes as the ‘ongoing social construction of the spatial at the level of social imaginary (collective mythologies,
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\(^{25}\) Chiaromonte was born in southern Italy in 1905 and died in 1972.

\(^{26}\) Simon Rycroft (1996: 426) argues that the Beat movement constituted an ‘intellectual revolt’ against conventionality.

\(^{27}\) Schechter (1980: 152; original emphasis) argues ‘the counterculture was given shape and direction by unconscious forces operating on a collective scale and with a particular purpose because the unconscious, according to Jung, is purposive; it does have a definite aim, which is self-regulation […] forcing the culture at large into an awareness of those values which it had been denying to its detriment’.
presuppositions) as well as interventions in the landscape’, the drift east was socially
constructed and spatialised for a new beginning. While the drift may have been
characterised as the ‘international pot trail, one stoned head step ahead of the highway
architects’ (Neville, 1970: 217) and mainstream tourism, it was movement generated by the
heart as a signifying social-practice, mobility that wasn’t considered a vacation by its
participants (Mills, 1970; Neville, 1970) but an escape from the dominant social order
‘whose civilised routines and deceptive ambiguities have become oppressive’ (Mills, 1973:
89). As much ‘pushed-out’ as ‘dropping-out’ (Mills, 1973), they brought an already
established reflexivity into the journey, their sense of common fate, of being in the same
boat and facing the same problems, ‘enabling the passing on of ideas, emotions and fellow
sentiments so that a feeling can become mobile itself’ (Adey, 2009: 174).

Their effort to escape or evade the dominant culture meant a level of clustering, sharing,
and ‘throwntogetherness’ (Massey, 2005) as disparate individuals were faced with ‘the
unavoidable challenge of negotiating a here-and-now’ (Massey, 2005: 140), striving to
‘speak, act, and work toward belonging to a world of others’ whilst they ‘simultaneously
strive to experience themselves as world makers’ (Jackson, 1998: 8). While the
counterculture was about ‘doing your own thing’, the challenge of the journey necessitated
invention, collaboration, negotiation and exchange of information, gossip, during pause and
in movement, on the buses heading east and between new and returning travellers,
providing ‘participants with a sense of membership grounded in strong emotional
experience and a shared sense of ideal’ (Hetherington, 2000: 78). From seeking transport,
crossing borders, finding places to stay, food, information and companionship,
geographical movement yielded interaction between people, upscaling the drift to an
affective collective. Bodies in ‘liberated rhythm’ (Neville, 1970) began to think of themselves
in relation to others, their movement, proximity and mutual aid strengthening and
cementing the ‘collectivity’ (Maffesoli, 1991). Similar to Simmel's forms of sociation,
‘experiencing something together is a factor of socialisation’ taking on the ‘the function of
aggregation and reinforcement’ (Maffesoli, 1991: 19). A taken-for-granted cognitive
assumption about the reality of the social world emerged, the commonality of perspectives
creating affective solidarities with those encountered and imagined others who are also in
the affective embrace.

Erik Cohen, one of the few researchers who commented on youth travel in the 1970’s,
suggested drifters (a label he coined) were part of a spectrum of vacation-takers (Cohen,
1972, 1973, 1974), a non-institutionalised tourist who enjoying independence as they shunned organised tours and all-inclusive resorts. Cohen’s ‘drifter’ was the most ‘most individualistic and least institutionalised’ (Cohen, 1973: 89) as they sought to envelop themselves in the host’s culture on a deep level by shunning any kind of connection with the tourist establishment, the ‘original’ drifter28 wandering ‘furthest from the beaten track’ (Cohen, 1973: 89). The drifter strived more than the ordinary tourist to reach places and people that are ‘really’ authentic; and ‘would display considerable touristic angst that places or events that appear authentic are in fact staged’ (Cohen, 2004: 46). Cohen’s (1973: 89) original drifter tended 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… The drifter has no fixed itinerary timetable and no well-defined goals of travel. He is almost wholly immersed in his host culture’. They were according to Cohen ‘the true rebels of the tourist establishment’, described them as ‘un-patriotic,’ ‘hedonistic’ and ‘anarchistic’ (Cohen, 1973), going abroad in order to get away from their homelands.

In 1973, Cohen further expanded the development of drifting by implicating it within patterns of ‘tourism’ consumerism, identifying a broad range of sociological motivations and behaviours by distinguishing between four drifter types: full-time drifters and part-time drifters, who could be either outward or inward oriented. In 1979, Cohen fully positioned drifting within tourism when he suggested that their were five different ‘modes of touristic experience,’ ranging from superficial journeys in search of mere pleasure to profound journeys in search of meaning. These he calls the ‘Recreational Mode’, the ‘Diversionary Mode’, the ‘Experiential Mode’, the ‘Experimental Mode’, and the ‘Existential Mode’. The experimental mode and the existential mode were related to the mass drifters, who he suggested were not as motivated to seek adventure and mix with local people and local culture as the original drifter who they replaced.

The mass drifters, he argues progressively turned inwards seeking the company of other drifters in drifter routes and establishments, losing interest and involvement with the local people, customs and landscape. Generally, there is not much evidence to support Cohen’s suggestion that a few original drifters were the basis for the drift east or that certain people

28 There is much to note about Cohen’s work, given he was one of the few academics to study drifters, whom he labeled, even though it wasn’t until the early 70’s that he became interested in the phenomena. An anthropologist by training, his interest in tourism was marginal, the intrusion of drifters into his anthropological studies in Israel antagonizing him, seeing them as an intrusion (Nash, 2007). He never travelled to India, researched their trails, or immersed himself in their world; basing his conceptualisation of the ‘original drifters’ on one ‘prototype’ traveller he met during anthropological fieldwork in Ayacucho in Peru (Cohen, 2004).
were predisposed to travel in certain modes. I argue it would be more accurate to suggest that various non-conformists, antiwar militants, counter-culturists, radicals, heads, dropouts, freaks, hippies and beatniks had tapped into a countercultural mobility fantasy, becoming ideological bedfellows on the road east (Tomory, 1996), learning occurring across time-space. Adler (1989) notes how a single code need not be fully shared by those whose efforts yield a recognisable style of performance. She argues that ‘consistency of outcome can result from conventionally governed patterns of cooperation between different segments of a division of labour’. The drifters shared experiences in the particular context of the journey enabling subjective actions to be named, conceptualised and objectified, the arrangements of their cultural identifies evolving over time-space to act in ways that enhanced their power of action and movement, while exiling and silencing others (primarily locals), narrativisation through homophilic relationships a key means of stitching a life trajectory across space-time.

While the tourism industry, media, society, government and other tourists could find no value from this evolving world, their mobility triggered ‘new attempts at fixity’ which slowly spawned a separate ‘drifter’ infrastructure that spread from Istanbul to Sydney. While Cohen (1973: 95) argues such infrastructure were the ‘paraphernalia of mass tourism against which the original drifters rebelled because’ because they robed the trip of its spontaneity and the experience of ‘real life’ in the host society, any clustering and congregation creates its own solidarities (Hall, 1968). Whenever there is ‘reciprocal typification of habitualized actions by types of actors’ (Berger and Luckmann, 1966: 72), ‘[w]e can properly begin to speak of roles when this kind of typification occurs in the context of an objectified stock of knowledge common to a collectivity of actors (ibid, 69), the ritualised interactions in time space enabling a certain type of social relationship to be obtained as verbal and non-verbal actions were repeated and ritualised, social action congealing as ‘recognizable and memorable entities’ (Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

As the drifters established their own places, ‘the place of its own power and will, from an ‘environment” (de Certeau, 1988: 36), an overland scene (bars, restaurants, hotels, shops, sites) soon emerged to draw out the connections between places, between people, between people and structures. Space is derived from ‘the arrangement of persons and objects in the physical world’ (Giddens, 1993: xv in Werlen, 1993) the newly constructed frames of reference of particular people on particular routes in particular places orienting individual actions. From accommodation, restaurants, record stores and other products and
services, their journey was quite dependent on community-provided products and services for survival (Odzer, 1995), and while intercultural reciprocity and acceptance was valued, their movement meant they often appropriated peoples, homes, religions; ‘the hippie subject positioned as having both the right and freedom to choose anything available’ (Stephens, 1998: 71). The poverty of many of the countries they passed through meant the felt they were free from the contamination of authority, timetables and money, Neville’s book Play Power highlighting the ignorance many drifters had of contemporary facts, as only the exotic side of peoples, countries and places became marked as desirable. OZ (Issue 36, July 1971) detailed an ‘Indian Summer’ describing the beach scene there and the ‘kind-hearted’ Goans, straightforward and honest who left the beaches to the ‘heads’ and the same time put up signs up stating ‘Indians are not allowed’ (Biswas, 2008). While difficult to establish the precise social background of the drifters, Cohen (1973: 92) noted it was a thoroughly ‘Western’ phenomenon, the counterculture generally recognised as an arena where whiteness emerged spatially, given the inequalities in resources required to consume this evolving world.

The drift east became an essentially collective expression as drifters created a world around themselves, with a different sense of time, marking out ‘their own social and spatial settings by the pathways they drew’ (Finnegan, 1989/2007: 318) and in the social spaces and actions constituting satisfying and sanctified paths, their mobility weaved places together. These pathways brought about the cohesion necessary for a travel style and an imagined world (community) to survive, a distinct way of being-in-the-world thriving within its boundaries, embedded its many components (organisations, transport, objects, music, clothes, technologies and spaces). The heightened sense of connection was articulated by physical encounters, the repetition of ‘normalised codes makes material, the belongings they purport to simply describe’, the ‘stylized repetition of acts’ cultivating the sign and sense of belonging’ (Bell, 1999: 3). As people, places and events became objects of knowledge, the world became more visible and mapped. Tomory (1996) noted that in Nepal, international visitors rose from 12,500 in 1966 to 90,000 in 1974, provoking notice and reaction from the media and society, the emergence of paths such as the hippie trail making possible the appropriation and ‘colonisation’ of the various territories they traversed. By transforming the ‘temporal articulation of places into a spatial sequence of
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29 Omar Swartz (1999: 80), writing of Sal and Dean’s (in the novel ‘On the Road’) journey to Mexico speaks of them as poachers who must first trespass on the Other’s territory, ‘borrowing the language, music, drugs, and despair of a repressed people in order to redescribe their own positions’. Given the cultural familiarity of the East that the counterculture had nurtured, the cultural traits attractive enough to steal had already largely identified in the countercultural media.

30 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/7300309.stm
points’ (de Certeau, 1988: 35), they became capable, in a spatial, bodily, temporal and literal sense of ‘doing their own thing, in their own time’ (Mills, 1973: 119). Their routes, symbols, expressive values, beliefs, attitudes when taken together became a meaningful path and away of being-in-the-world. Made performable, each new individual stepping into this world was subject to a similar context, building up patterns of action, organising their perceptions into dispositions and coherent patterns and interests, and ‘thus producing practices that are themselves similar’ (Bourdieu, 1989: 17). By the late 1960’s, they begin to ‘behave in a touristic sort of way’ and ‘inhabit and use characteristic artifacts’ (Boniface and Fowler, 1993: 155), spatial intervention soon projected onto maps and guidebooks, creating preconfigured meeting places and accommodation, its boundaries and routes spreading as people applied its logic elsewhere. A second wave, for example, expanded the drift south to Africa around 1972, as drifters headed to Tunisia, Libya, Uganda, Malawi and Kenya and onto Egypt.

Sustained until the mid 1970’s, the blurred landscapes they produced confused governance systems that has relied on a clear delineation of tourist and migrant subject identities and countries who had once welcomed the drifters now labeled their mobility ‘criminal’, ‘deviant’ or ‘alternative,’ with a number of countries refusing them entry visas and deporting them. The world economy also collapsed in the early 1970’s and the value of western currencies declined, creating a severe recession and stagflation between 1973-1983 as unemployment rose across all the advanced capitalist countries (Harvey, 1990). Consolidated by deflation in the early 1980s, a resurgence of neo-conservatism in many western countries, cold war conflicts, military dictatorships and proxy ‘hot’ zones in many regions, combined to make this world less popular and desirable. However, this world was now embedded in western social imaginaries as an as organised field, where stories, novels, movies and images mapped out what people would aspire and expect, by signifying its building blocks, key story lines and practices. Never in need of a major revival, reignited desires in the late 1980’s meant this world could again reignite, its dominant participants were recast in a new subject position as the ‘mass-drifter’ label was relabeled the ‘backpacker’ (Cohen, 2004, Elsrud, 2001; O’ Reilly, 2006).

2.3 Backpacking.

Just as the countercultural was enabled by consistently low unemployment between 1946 and 1973, the mid 1980’s saw the global economy improve once more and combined with
the fall of communism and the cold war; a period of affluence swept the western world, which saw the popularity of many ‘styles’ connected with the 1960’s find renewed growth (Stephens, 1998), albeit in a more depoliticised, post-fordist environment. Just as drifting had emerged during an age of ‘relative affluence of modern society’ that made ‘competition for an occupational career less urgent and less challenging’ (Cohen, 1973: 94), economic prosperity combined with a burst of globalisation in the 1980s meant ‘the economy was able […] to carry substantial numbers of voluntarily unemployed people living on substantial incomes, based on surplus’ (Brake, 1990: 94-95). Increasing affluence led to expectations of personal fulfillment but rather than rebelling against society, Yeoman et al, (2006) argue that the youth were now quite inclined towards global capitalism, seeking excitement through various forms of escapism and liminality. The style-obsessed ‘new cultural mood of the 1980s’ (Callinicos, 1989: 168-169) replaced a society no longer possessing the ‘cultural capacity to provide modern man with a coherent world-view’ (Kim, 2003: 22).

As opportunities for alternative lifestyles emerged, the 1980’s saw a distinct revival of practices previously associated with the counterculture, ‘the sixties in the eighties’ (Collier and Horowitz, 1989) reproducing the radical culture of the 1960’s in everything from the personal computer to surfing (Thornton, 1996; Turner, 2006). The correlation between economic capital and cultural capital became decoupled, the sharp movement towards individualisation, mobility and an increased orientation towards post-material values of consumption loosening ties between wealth and taste. As society entered a highly consumption-oriented phase (Roberson, 1992), cultural standards and lifestyles were no longer exclusively set by elite cultural tastes and practices (Ritzer, 2005), new subjectivities worked outside the middle-class habitus or nation-state boundaries. While economic capital and ‘cultural dispositions’ were previously a prerequisite for cultural capital, only available to those with money to buy it, world travel only available to a few clearly defined class groupings, ‘alternative’ lifestyles and alternative mobilities (Jensen, 2009) associated with (sub)cultural capital (Thornton, 1996) was ‘acquired by means of a sort of withdrawal from economic necessity' (Bourdieu, 1984: 12), clouding class backgrounds, given it was capital that was ‘extra-curricular’ and could not be inherited or learned at school. While key gatekeepers often set up class-linked barriers to a destination’s cultural capital, retaining it for the existing elite, ‘in the context of a post-traditional order, the self becomes a reflexive project’ (Giddens 1991: 32), involving ‘the strategic adoption of lifestyle options’ related to a planned ‘trajectory’, wherein the individual can become geared towards constructing and
maintaining a meaningful biographical narrative (Giddens, 1991: 243-244).

Fashioning an identity suggests ‘who we are like, from whom we are different, and what of our infinitely complex selves we profile to say ‘this is who I am’’ (Sender, 2004: 11). Giddens (1991: 200) notes that a late-modern individual who has to be ‘different’ from all others ‘has no chance of reflexively developing a coherent self-identity’ and must manifest his/her stance or allegiance towards a particular orientation, through and with others. Revived and repackaged scenes in the 1980s associated with the countercultural imagination began to again express themselves through music, magazines, direct action, dress, festivals and other practices, the ‘consumption of space’ (Lefebvre, 1991a) becoming an ‘enactment of lifestyle’ rather than simply the means to a lifestyle (Hetherington, 1992). Often outwardly anti-materialistic and demanding corporeal involvement, bodily practices again becoming a means to exploit a terrain of possibilities, the power of the imagination enabling individuals to inhabit social contexts and infuse their life with new meaning, even if framed even within the confines of everyday life and those most precious weeks of the year. Extreme sports (surfing, skateboarding, frisbee throwing, parachuting, hot hog skiing, snowboarding, rock climbing), new age travelling, new age spirituality to Goan trance (Saldanha, 2002; St John, 2001) evoked the countercultural imagination, offering opportunities for individuals to release subjectivities and form social relations with others whom they could articulate a specific belonging. These worlds offered to structure lives when acted upon, worlds that can be ‘mapped onto and experienced through spatial patterns, or, perhaps more accurately, habitation patterns’ (Dourish and Bell, 2007: 424), producing discourses, systems and spaces of production and consumption that helped individuals define who they thought they were. The repertoire of codes initiated by a communal countercultural imagination that led to thousands to take the journey east were directly implicated in the making of new mobility cultures, embodying ‘a power that can restore a kind of presence to absent things’ (Hartman, 1999: 99).

The meaning society and individuals gave to mobility was related to cultural norms and a developed tourist culture, creating a bridge to practices such as sightseeing and other shared ways of doing, ‘a sub-set of behavioural patterns and values that tend to emerge only when the visitors are travelling’ (Williams, 1998: 157). However, mobility related practices again began to produce identification and meanings beyond the state-led mobility politics, family units and touristic discourses; innovations in communications, transport and information technology ‘leading to new ways of seeing self and other, places and territories,
and ultimately the social and material environment of the contemporary world’ (Jensen, 2009: xv). Increasing intersecting movements of bodies, ideas, objects and capital across time-space helped to create changing spatialities, allowing individuals to assert agency and identity through mobility, new speeds and rhythms of everyday social practice an important contrast between contemporary social life and that of the sixties. Mobilities driven by voluntary leisure, forced migration, economic need, political circumstances or natural disaster constitute new networks, patterns of social and new spaces and places, where social practice develop, the performances of moving often forcing the negotiation and re-negotiation of identities. From the local, the national to the global, globalisation began to work from the inside out, or bottom up. From ravers in Ibiza, graffiti artists in New York to New Age Travellers travelling from festival to festival and new age spiritualists travelling to and from places of ‘power’, people began to construct notions of mobility in their everyday lives, their imaginative capacity creating encounters and proximities that the media or ‘tourists’ might see as untenable, inhabitable, deviant, hedonistic, oppressive and hostile. Diverse projects of the self and alternative life trajectories gave meaning to various imagined worlds (communities), the scope for belonging to worlds that you choose, rather than communities, ethnicities or nations that choose. To live and belong successfully in these worlds is often contingent on strategically occupying a self-marginalised position, if only during a ‘liminoid’ phase, where ‘the body regains a certain right to use, a right which is half imaginary and half real, and which does not go beyond an illusionary ‘culture of the body,’ an imitation of natural life’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 353). These imagined worlds (communities) are significantly different from traditional holiday experiences, since they were (are) not a positional marker of relative wealth, relatively unconnected to ones social position or class structures, instead bringing people contingently together people from a range of social backgrounds that share patterns of movement, practice and consumption. Entering these worlds is not a trivial matter; identities emerging between ‘chaos and order, between neurotic attachment to the ‘certainties’ of the past, and a creative risk oriented leap of imagination beyond slavish adherence to routines as previously enacted’ (Sugrue, 2005: 158).

One such world that seemed to stand outside and even against the meta-narratives of society and routine was budget independent travel, which continued to invoke desire and draw adherents throughout the late 1970’s and early 1980’s. It remained a socially constructed world as individuals continued to be part of a world that had a fluid and irregular shape, a world which retained the core principles of its predecessor, a set of
imaginaries – shared cultural representations, understandings, regularities, ethos and truths. While drawing those seeking to ‘avoid co-optation by the ‘straight’ world’ (Wolfe, 1968: 152) in the sixties, it remained a means of differentiation and a cultural space for people to express themselves. While the journey into the liminal and liminoid embodiment didn’t carry any direct memories of the turbulent social and political struggles of the 1960’s, this world drew from media representations, direct narratives, stories, images and alternative guidebooks. Lonely Planet publications, always on the brink on bankruptcy found financial stability as their guidebook sales took off in the 1980’s (Wheeler and Wheeler, 2007: 144-150). They along with the media in general became a powerful influence, helping to recycle an imaginative cultural narrative and potentially weakening the hold of the structured and structuring dispositions of the middle class habitus, enabling people to imagine themselves differently, offering audiences ‘a series of elements...out of which scripts can be formed of imagined lives’ (Appadurai, 1990: 299). Alternative guidebooks reinforced the reality of such imaginative boundaries, where geographic movement could open up the possibility of encounters, experiences and fulfillment, where a transformation of the self could be performed through one’s interactions with the social over time-space. While there was little research on the declining phenomena of drifting and the (re)emergence of budget independent travel in the 1980’s (Cohen, 1982a, Riley, 1988), the recovering global economy saw the phenomenon international budget travel gradually began to grow once again, primarily in Australia, Thailand and the Philippines (Cohen, 1982a; Smith, 1992).

Riley (1988) found their style was directly based on drifting; but argued any direct association with the hedonistic and anarchistic drifters was no longer accurate. Instead: ‘the average traveler prefers to travel alone, is educated, European, middle-class, single, obsessively concerned with budgeting his/her money, and at a juncture in life’ (Riley, 1988: 313). These budget travellers were recast as a distinct ‘category’ of tourism that was categorically different from mass tourism or ‘institutionalized’ tourism flows (Riley, 1988, Sørensen, 2003), continuing to lead very separate lives, ‘staying in different accommodation, visiting different restaurants and bars, mingling with different people’ (Welk, 2004: 86). While a flurry of sociological terms were used to describe them, they are not a ‘group’ in any sociological sense, ‘having neither regular contacts among each other nor having an integrated social structure’ (Binder, 2004). They were relabeled as ‘budget travellers’ (Riley, 1998) ‘youth travelers’ (Adler, 1985), ‘free independent travellers’ (Clarke, 2004a), ‘nomads’ (Cohen, 1973), ‘long-term budget travelers’ (Riley, 1988), ‘youth tourists’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Main Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drifter</td>
<td>Cohen, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomad</td>
<td>Cohen, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanderer</td>
<td>Vogt, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youthful traveller</td>
<td>Teas, 1974/1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth traveller</td>
<td>Adler, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget traveller</td>
<td>Riley, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth tourist</td>
<td>Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-institutionalised tourist</td>
<td>Uriely et al, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free independent traveller</td>
<td>Clarke, 2004a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget tourist/economy tourist</td>
<td>Elsrud, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tourist</td>
<td>Tucker, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpacker(^{31})</td>
<td>Hampton, 1998; Howard, 2007; Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995; Murphy, 2000; Pearce, 1990; Scheyvens 2002a; Teo and Leong, 2005; Uriely et al, 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: External labeling and internal identification.

While not providing ‘hard’ sociological parameters, these labels highlighted the shift away from the drifter label, a process that was as much about recasting and ‘de-marketing’ the ‘drifter’ concept (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2001, 2004) as much as creating a convenient / accepted shorthand for these budget travellers. There is some contestation as to where the label backpacker originated, but the Australian Youth Hostel Association claimed it first mentioned the term in their magazine during April 1978\(^{32}\) while Slaughter (2004) notes how

\(^{31}\) The term ‘backpacker is also used to describe a category of rapper (USA), those who hike to remote, predetermined locations (USA) and those who carry drugs by foot from Mexico to the United States of America.

\(^{32}\) According to newspaper articles celebrating the centenary of the Youth Hostel Association in 2009, the YHA claimed they first coined the term backpacker in 1978 (http://tinyurl.com/ku6aer).
the term was being used by a number of Australian hostels in the mid 1980’s. Smith (1992) notes its use by Boracayans to describe the international long-term budget travellers in the Philippines who started to arrive there in 1985, taking advantage of the beaches, cheap accommodation and food. So numerous were these Australians, Europeans and a few North Americans were in 1987, the local newspaper headlined a story entitled ‘Gringo Express’ (Smith, 1992: 146).

The problem with the term, like those that went before it, is that it generalises, homogenises and objectified a set of practices and affinities, assimilating them into a single identity. However, given their unifying constructs, behaviors and typical characteristics, the external identification of ‘backpacker’ became an internal identification (Jenkins, 1996) used by many backpackers themselves. Widely used and a easily understood descriptor, it was favored by policy makers, statisticians, academic researchers, marketing publications and even those budget travellers who were resistant to being labeled at all. The label made them legible in a modern society, its use and institutionalisation an instrumental process that appended slowly over a number of years. In terms of demographic and social background, backpackers are still predominantly ‘Western’ and middle-class, the majority under thirty years of age (Loker, 1993; Sørensen, 2003), traveling between two months and two years (Loker, 1993; Murphy, 2001; Pearce, 1990). Attracting attention in sociological, anthropological, and psychological research (Desforges, 1998; Firth and Hing, 1999; Hampton, 1998; Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995; Ross, 1997), researchers have focused on analysing backpacker homogeneity / heterogeneity in terms of age, nationality, motivation and gender (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2001; Cohen, 2004; Desforges, 1998; Hampton, 1998; Elsrud, 2001; Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995; Maoz 2006, 2007a; Muzaini, 2006; Murphy, 2001; Noy, 2004; Pearce, 1990; Richards and Wilson, 2004a,b; Riley, 1988; Sørensen, 1999, 2003; Uriely et al, 2002; Westerhausen, 2002), finding those entering this world disparate (Thyne et al, 2004; van Egmond, 2007) and drawn from very different age groups, countries, ages and gender. Research by Uriely et al, (2002) points out that backpackers share an identity based on the form of travel they take (extended travel, itinerary, visited destinations, tendency toward low spending), while they may be heterogeneous in terms of psychological attributes (attitude towards home culture, motivations for travel and the meanings they assign the travel experience). Notable and popular definitions include:

… likely to be middle class, at a juncture in life, somewhat holder than the earlier travellers
on average, college educated, and not aimless drifters. They travel under flexible timetables and itineraries. Most expect to rejoin the work force in the society they left. (Riley, 1988: 326).

They [backpackers] prefer to stay in budget accommodation, they spend more time travelling around [...] than the average visitor, and they enjoy interacting with people, both locals and other travellers. They are also more likely to independently organise their travels. (Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995: 840).

... young and budget-minded tourists who exhibit a preference for inexpensive accommodation, an emphasis on meeting other people (locals and outsiders), an independently organized and flexible itinerary, longer than brief vacations, and an emphasis on informal and participatory recreational activities. (Murphy, 2001: 50-51).

Backpackers usually follow highly prescribed routes, share ‘alternative’ values, pursue particular practices, and altogether adopt regular dispositions towards other tourists, toward self-development, and toward engagement with difference, and part of this involves valorizing a more ‘authentic’ sensual experience of ‘otherness. (Edensor, 2006b: 39).

While there is acknowledgment of backpacking’s unifying constructs, many scholars have sough to identify a number of niches, taxonomies, segments or typologies within backpacking, their faith in the ordered, the rational and objective reality followed through rational inquiry but often leading to lifeless findings. This rationality is based on the priori-assumption that backpackers are so different that by not researching difference is ‘dangerous’, ‘since it will surely result in at least some of these visitors being dissatisfied or not particularly well catered for’ (Loker-Murphy, 1996: 25). While Vogt (1976) first suggested that drifters (wanderers) could be divided, Loker-Murphy (1996) was first to segment the backpacker population according to their motivational psychographics. Identifying four sub-groups of backpackers with respect to their travel motivations, she labeled them escapers/relaxers, social/excitement-seekers, self-developers and achievers.

More recently, Ryan and Mohsin (2001) argued that backpackers could be divided into those who had left a previous career to travel, those who had just completed studies; and those who were holidaying during periods of normal holiday leave. O’ Reilly (2005, 2006)

33 Vogt argued that drifters would be divided according to whether their holidays were institutionalized (organized) or non- institutionalised (where the individual organizes his/her own travel and accommodation).
developed a set of five backpacker ideal types based primarily on the individual’s approach to the task of travel. Firstly, there is the ‘professional backpacker’, whose travel is not so much a leisure activity as the main purpose of life, taking precedence over all other life projects. Secondly, there is the ‘Gap year’ backpacker, who usually travels finishing secondary school or university. Thirdly, there is the ‘life crisis’ backpacker who responds to a major life disruption by taking the decision to travel (inheritance, redundancy, relationship breakdown). Fourthly, O’Reilly identifies the ‘partyer’ whose mode of travel resembles a holiday seeking sun, sand, and beer and (often) drugs. Finally, she identifies the short-term backpacker who while preferring to travel independently has only a short period of time.

Ateljevic and Doorne (2001) distinguished between ‘traditional long-term travellers’ and ‘mainstream’ backpacker groups, who they argue have different underlining travel motivations leading to different form of consumer behaviour. They consider traditional travellers as generally ‘well-travelled and experienced and regard themselves as ‘real travelers’ as distinct from tourists’ and are ‘motivated by feelings of dissatisfaction with their home societies and the pressures of everyday life’ (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2001: 174-175) while the mainstream backpackers ‘did not seek to compare themselves with other “backpacker” markets (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2001: 181).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backcountry</th>
<th>Mainstream Backpackers</th>
<th>‘Dedicated’ Backpackers</th>
<th>‘Pioneers’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Hedonists’</td>
<td>Seek places ‘where the action is’ (parties)</td>
<td>Stay on the beaten backpacker track</td>
<td>Go outside the backpacker circuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek fun/excitement/drugs/sex</td>
<td>Exhibit a generalized curiosity</td>
<td>Exhibit a generalized curiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go to the ‘famous’ places</td>
<td>Visit places known from travel literature</td>
<td>Go beyond ‘must see’ places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not prepared to renounce comfort</td>
<td>Renounce comfort – to a certain extent</td>
<td>Renounce comfort completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have no desire to learn or connect</td>
<td>Express great desire to learn and connect</td>
<td>Express a great desire to learn and connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are not/hardly interested in interaction</td>
<td>Actual learning and interaction are comparatively great</td>
<td>Actual learning and interaction greatest of all categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are indifferent towards ‘authenticity’</td>
<td>‘Authenticity’ is important but highly negotiable</td>
<td>‘Authenticity’ is important and not negotiable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have no experiences of culture or nature</td>
<td>Have either shallow or ‘deep’ experiences</td>
<td>Claim to have ‘deep’ experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volumes depend upon destination</td>
<td>Small volumes</td>
<td>Very small volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term backpackers</td>
<td>Both short- and long-term backpackers</td>
<td>Long-term backpackers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Backpacker typology created by Van Egmond (2007: 138).

Van Egmond (2007), as seen in table 2, similarly differentiated between various ‘mainstream backpackers’ who stay on the beaten track, visit places from known literature and where interaction is limited against ‘dedicated backpackers’ who try and get off the beaten track, renounce comfort and claim to have deep experiences. Shaffer (2004)
described differences between leisure and culture backpackers, while Hecht and Martin (2006) found difference between contemporary and traditional backpackers. While typologies mark the shift from ‘essentialist and unifying depictions of the tourist experience as a general type toward an approach that stresses its diverse and plural characteristics’ (Uriely, 2005: 205), such typologies do little to increase our understanding of backpacking and its underlying structure. By approaching backpacking as ‘tourism’ and forcing new typologies, researchers often fail to acknowledge its history and their ‘learning trajectory’ (Wenger, 1998), wherein individuals share in and are shaped by the journey; a subjectivity in progress and a self reflexive project, where subjectivity, agency and identity must be recognised and confirmed by others. While asserting this, the identity of each backpacker has a unique learning trajectory, their own biography and ‘apprenticeship of observation’ (Lortie, 1975), but the distinctive features of their backpacking experiences are also connected to and are part of a field they are historically and socially situated, becoming active participants and creators of the discourse used in that space.

Distance and the encounters that mobility yields allow them to suspend the power of norms and values that govern their daily lives (Boniface and Fowler, 1993) for a world that is represented as more real than the one they are leaving. This is a well-lit world of movement, solidarities, hostels, airports and crowds ‘that helps us understand the real by also being more than the real’ (Begg, 2005: 634), connecting a world ‘populated with characters ‘felt to be there’ and which continually splice into the real world’ (Hermans and Kempen, 1993: 71). It is a world sold as an opportunity to get hold of ‘real’ experiences, a ‘second birth’ that offers a secondary socialisation that involves maintaining a moving presence with others whose spatial movement is generative of meaning but also a component in that socialisation process. It requires a coherent integration of actions and a new way of ‘being’, ‘doing' and taking part, intersecting to ‘form a style of use, a way of being and a way of operating’ (Certeau, 1988: 100), the possibility of agency and the ‘the ability to make history’ (Grossberg, 1997: 366), demanding a reflexive monitoring of actions as the whole body dwells in movement, enabling them to participate in an assemblage of practices that constitutes a performance.

The journey involves ‘an ongoing milieu of folding and unfolding, intertwining and diverging, from which subjectivity and meaning emerges’ (Wylie, 2002: 445; original emphasis), where subjectivity and agency that are clearly not only spatial in nature but also about the proximities and solidarities, ‘about the bodily co-presence of people......intermittent
movements of physical proximity between people that seen to be desirable or even obligatory’ enabling ‘people to develop encounters, displaying attentiveness and commitment’ (Bærenholdt et al, 2004: 146). While this world produces touristic type objects, images, language and ideas, it is also ‘a stage upon which to act out the binaries by which we make sense of and order the world’ (Minca and Oakes, 2006: 13) and can be ‘responsible for altering how people appear to experience the modern world’ (Lash and Urry, 1994: 256). It is not merely the act of travelling from A to B that help individuals figure out where they belong, but encounters with places and people serve as points of belonging and orientation through which desires, identity and agency can be exhibited and demonstrated. However, as this world has evolved into and been given ongoing legitimacy; the tourism industry, governments and others have exploited backpacker discourses to exert power over people by creating new ‘backpacker’ ‘positions’, extending a label in which people are fitted: ‘power-bound and are influenced by Foucauldian agents from the time they first seek information and make travel plans until they return home’ (Cheong and Miller, 2000: 381).

2.3.1 The Working Holiday Maker (WHM).

Countries around the world have introduced Working Holiday Maker (WHM) class visas so as to make backpacking more productive and like tourist visas are usually issued between reciprocal countries. Called ‘migrant tourist workers’ (Kinnaird, 1999), they are most commonly called working backpackers (Allon, 2004; Allon et al, 2008b; Clarke, 2004b; Murphy, 2001; O’ Reilly, 2006). These backpackers usually have a destination in mind given they move to a country with an already claimed visa to work, their trip tending to be social and cultural; involving work, leisure, travel and pleasure. Australian visas, for example are primarily offered to young people under the age of thirty to ‘technically’ supplement their travels. While the original aim of these programmes was to foster cultural exchange and allow closer contact with the local community, the schemes have been increasingly utilised to attract international mobile labour.

2.3.2 The Flashpacker.

The terms ‘flashpacker\(^{34}\)’ (Pursall, 2005) and ‘backpacker plus’ (Cochrane, 2005), have been taken up by media commentators, tourism officials, academics and research

\(^{34}\) The exact origin of the term is unknown, but likely originated in 2004 in the United Kingdom from a ‘Future laboratory report of 1,000 consumers.'
organisations since the start of the millennium to describe backpackers characterised by their short travel length, speed and their utilisation of the infrastructure developed for backpackers. Their travel is centered on specific hub airport locales where access is good, their travel undertaken for personal self-development, distinction and personal autonomy rather than any affiliation to backpacking or a learning about the world through given sub-cultural practices. Described by Cochrane (2003) as well paid experienced travellers who speak some of the local language, they have a high daily spend (relative to backpackers) but require better facilities as they follow a purposeful itinerary. Facilitated by modern innovations in transport and communication technologies, their mobility is interpreted individually but largely dependent on external institutions to provide an experience rich environment. Seeking ‘proof of the authentic’ (Kaplan, 1996: 61), they utilise their economic capital alongside their cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1996), investing it in their movement and in doing so, increasingly set the conditions within the backpacking industry (UNWTO, 2008). The flashpacker is being noted and pursued by countries such as Fiji, New Zealand and Australia; a strategy supported by academics (Jarvis and Peel, 2010; Cochrane, 2005) and industry associations who argue that their economic productivity is much more than backpackers.

2.3.3 The Gapper.

While backpacking has come to be accepted, it is still characterised as being aimless and undirected by universities, career guidance counsellors, employers, parents and schools, the gap year for all intensive purposes becoming a replacement term, a form of backpacking that has more convertibility into other forms of capital, a ‘rite of passage’ (van Gennep, 1960[1909]) from youth to adulthood financed by parents (Lahelma and Gordon, 2008) with up to 200,000 young people (aged 16-25) from the United Kingdom every year exercising their ‘right’ to a gap year (Jones, 2004). Primarily originating from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and the United States, it is constructed and expressed as a means of social distinction, its symbolic power legitimised from the ability of elite social groups to define and legitimise a vision of travel style based on their own specific desires and needs (Soderman and Snead, 2008). The gap year is described as that period primarily but not exclusively taken by a student as a break from education between school and university, but has been expanded to include those who undertake breaks during or part of university education, post University or during employment. Jones (2004: 8) in a

---

35 Review of gap year provision, Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (Jones, 2004).
report for the Department for Skills and Education in the United Kingdom defines the gap year as ‘any time period of time between 3 and 24 months which an individual takes ‘out’ of formal education, training or the workplace, and where the time-out sites in the context of a longer career trajectory’ although other studies indicate the average duration is one to two months (Soderman, and Snead, 2008). While Simpson (2004) argues the ‘gap year’ was once a radical activity, dominated by charities and inspired by the hippie generation, it is now primarily associated with structured programmes, managed and facilitated by providing organisation (Jones, 2004). These organisations have emerged as large multinational players, creating an institutionally accepted gap year industry, which helps develop new citizens for a global age, offering ‘credentialed cultural capital’ (Di Maggio, 1982). Complex discourses have developed around the gap year, entailing a shift from collective idealism to the infinitely more saleable values of individual career development, often sold to parents as offering a means to accumulate ‘experiences’, ‘business skills’, ‘leadership skills’ and ‘distinction’. In education, where ‘educational qualifications are no longer sufficient in themselves to guarantee success’ (Heath, 2007: 91-92), travel is becoming increasingly ‘incorporated into a framework that views it in largely instrumental terms, emphasising the advantages to be gained over other students rather than as an experience worth pursuing for its own sake’ (Heath, 2007: 91-92), the restructuring of work opportunities placing ‘intense pressure on middle-class parents as they seek to prepare their children for a new range of flexible jobs’ (Jeffrey and McDowell, 2004: 134).

The middle class habitus—‘the durably installed generative principle’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 78), means parents seek to pass on advantages to their children. Given the costs involved, these gap years are offered as a profitable investment, demanding a ‘high degree of economic confidence, if not actual wealth’ (Simpson, 2004: 63), the ability to ‘consume’ the gap year ‘mediated by both cultural and economic conditions, so that class becomes both a condition of, and is reproduced through, the process of consumption’ (Simpson, 2004: 63). It is promoted as the securest, most beneficial, most rewarding option for one’s child, where individuals are encouraged to bring an ‘appropriate level of seriousness to their gap-year planning in order to maximise the benefits’ (Heath, 2007: 92). As schools, religious groups, charities, institutions (the armed services, church’s), non-profit organisations, newspapers, universities and government departments legitimise the gap year as valuable currency, a ‘good gap year’ has become a mark of distinction, taste and status that is less about altruism but more about its convertibility back to linguistic, academic, economic, scholastic and university capital (Gogia, 2006; Heath, 2007; Jones, 2004; Simpson, 2004).
Key gatekeepers, such as universities believe such structured travel should be rewarded, highlighting its exclusionary nature since they advance the careers of socially dominant groups and set up class-linked barriers to the less privileged. Mobility is acceptable if it means to ‘get somewhere’, encouraged as long as it results in ‘improvement’ (Cresswell, 1993: 259), while mobility that is apparently purposeless, without accreditation and aimless is often discouraged. Rather than resist or challenge hegemonic cultural values, the cultural capital accumulated simply reinforces reinforcing the value of the old capital of which the elite enjoy a disproportionate share. Cultural capital is not a resource available and valuable to everyone, since it is largely the property of the existing elite.

2.3.4 Backpacker Tours.

Dedicated companies have begun to offer interconnected transport and accommodation options to ‘backpackers’, existing at a local, national and transnational basis ranging from half day tours to those lasting close to a year (inclusive tours, point-to-point transport and hop-on-hop-off systems), their popularity coming to influence backpacking more generally (Bell, 2005; Vance, 2004). Companies such as Contiki (established 1962) have offered ‘van tours’ since the 1960s and were initially geared towards and valued for local interaction. Today, these tours are largely built around ‘must see’ events, people and places, their reputations for hedonism, becoming more important than natural beauty or cultural significance (Bell, 2005; Tucker, 2003; 2005; Westerhausen and Macbeth, 2003). Associated with the institutionalism of backpacking (Vance, 2004; Wilson et al, 2008), they provide ‘quasi-private’ mobility (Urry, 2006) that can subordinate other mobilities, as they dictate how backpackers experience and perform the world they enter; often told how to act, move. communicate and dwell.

These tours can encompass the full length of an individual’s trip, and rather than integrating or enveloping them into backpacking, their experiences are mediated, initiated and directed towards intense in-group social cohesion. Tucker (2005) notes that the staff on a backpacker tour of the South Island (New Zealand) controlled performances, utilising megaphones, videos, music and competitions to direct their gaze. The activities internal to each group ‘inevitably takes on more importance than anything external to the group’\(^{36}\) (Tucker, 2003) with participants often abusive to those outside such tours. Enabled by expert systems these ‘overlanders’ (the vehicles are often made to ‘look’ overland), have

\(^{36}\) Bell (2005) notes one company motto was FIFO or ‘Fit in or Fuck off’ (Bell, 2005: 432).
generated new patterns of travel, staffed and guided by those ‘believed to know the safe routes and safe places to stop’ (Bell, 2005: 438). Hottola (2008) argues these transport systems are metaspatial bubbles that keep out the Other, to ‘shield or to immunise against casual or dangerous encounters’ (Atkinson and Flint, 2004). Those with ‘the right attitude’ (Mowforth and Munt, 2003) accept the trade-off of autonomy for sociability, fun, experiences, convenience and seamless mobility (Tucker, 2005), enabling individuals to enact a spatial subjectivity without performances of self being drawn into question. The rules of the game are prescribed by guides, where bodies are ‘tutored and disciplined, kept together and directed by assumptions about what is deemed ‘appropriate’ by group terms, and principally by the orders of the guide’ (Edensor, 1998a).

I have highlighted the extension of the label to indicate how backpacking has experienced a trend towards ‘the industrialization of a style of travel, which had traditionally prided itself on avoiding the travel industry’ (Richards and King, 2003: 17), the label extended and definitions broadened to attract greater swaths of society, the extension in gap years as well as ‘grey nomads’ (Onyx and Leonard, 2005, 2007) and ‘study backpackers’ (Jarvis and Peel, 2008)37, highlighting how any imagined world can be invaded and occupied. Such positions do not offer socialisation into the imagined world (community) of backpacking, the ‘active process of learning and social development that occurs at people interact with each other and become acquainted with the social world in which they live, and as they form ideas about who they are, and make decisions about their goals and behaviours’ (Coakley, 1998: 88). Those entering via these positions can not be seen as actively participating in the appropriation of (sub)cultural capital, although some individuals may use these positions as a basis to gain confidence before actually experiencing the world without expert mediation.

2.4 Chapter Summary.

Coming to prominence in the early 1990’s, studies suggest backpacking constitutes a distinct category (form / type) of tourism, where identities are produced and performed through mobility and what mobility can yield. However, I argue that backpacking must be seen in relation to its own historic development, its emergence, I argue, directly emerging through countercultural antecedents corralled into what we now call ‘hippies’. A convenient label for a disparate population, their congregation in urban enclaves lay ‘outside’ societies,
becoming nodes of importance from which everything radiated, attracting the disaffected and the imaginative, so as to ‘experience an atmosphere of intensified engagement with other like-minded people’ (Blackshaw and Crabbe, 2004: 143). Becoming isolated from the rest of society, their urban utopias became characterised as deviant and were closed down but when the counterculture seemed poised to implode, the spirit of its imagination radiated outwards in back to the land movements, protest marches, concerts and the road east, reigniting the dream of empowered individualism and collaborative communities. Very little has been written about the historical development of touristic mobility in general, whether it is educational tourists or religious tourists such as pilgrims. I sought to explore the historical context within which backpacker mobility evolved from this imagination, and argue backpacking was unleashed by the countercultural imagination, the assemblage of images, narratives, beliefs, objects giving birth to a new travelling culture informed by shared ways of doing.

Rather than made and remade in the imaginations of politicians, policy makers, advertising executives, the power of the imagination conjured up alternative visions of the world by which individuals could connect with the possibilities opened up by globalisation. As much as the back to the land movement was imagined as a new world, ‘a land of egalitarian communities linked to one another by a network of shared beliefs’ (Turner, 2006: 33), for others the road east offered a mobility fantasy that ultimately produced its own field of value by imposing values and meaning on what they considered ‘free space’, lifting In some cases, symbols from other cultures out of context and appropriating them. Drawing a dispersed population from across the western world who were escaping ‘war, aggression, competition, death machinery’ (Schechter, 1989: 152) between the period 1965 and 1975, the countercultural imagination was stressed upon lived and imaginary landscapes, a world represented as a community of ‘turned on’ individuals. Physical proximity, empathy and affinities allowed those journeying to adjust to each others subjective thoughts and feelings, inter-subjective ‘stocks of knowledge’ developing that enabled them to reach mutual understanding. The drift east was a push towards a new synthesis—a revolt of the conscious and the beyond conscious making visible the need for something mysterious and mythical to balance the technocratic reality of their homes and societies.

---

38 Robertson (1995: 46) notes that globalization encourages us to ‘sift the global-cultural scene for ideas and symbols relevant to our identities’. 
While the drift east relocated marginally emplaced individuals in a world in flux\(^{39}\), adding spontaneous and unpredictable dimensions to their life, the drift east soon internalised some of the structures and hierarchies of the Establishment. Patterns of social action, routes, language and social spaces became institutionalised, developing without any single actor or group of actors intentionally striving for coherence, a coherence that offered an ensemble of possibilities, their joined up movements, weaving places, events, people, objects, ideas together to give shape to space and the 'illusion of transparency'. This space was lent 'a miraculous quality' open to the free play of human agency, willfulness, and imagination (Lefebvre, 1991a: 27-29). While trafficking in the iconography of the post-colonial, mobility became etched onto the ground through freak buses, hotels, timetables, maps and itineraries (Thrift, 1996), the now labeled drifters becoming very visible as they became mapped onto the landscape ideologically, physically and materially, but like the pilgrims, 'they lost their battle by winning it' (Bauman, 1995: 88). Countries decided not to build on a generated form of mobility culture that could not be accounted for and soon sought to shut down this world. While counter-hegemonic activities were partially rewritten within touristic discourses and sold back to society, backpacking as an external identification soon became an internal identification that individuals took up in the early 1990's. Now legitimised by the media, industry and academia, 'a spatialized structural dichotomy of 'over there' and 'back here'' (Crang, 2006: 48) was reinstated, a complex ‘repertoires of images’ and narratives of ethnoscapes leading to the further desire and acquisition of movement (Appadurai, 1990, 1996). Today, as people are seeking to make sense of the world, ‘imagined worlds’ (communities) serve to with varying degree, give agency to those that allow these worlds to envelop them, offering a ‘style of life’ (Giddens, 1991) that can serve to construct a person’s individual identity. Whether called the Beats, Beatnicks, hippies or backpackers, each added up to ‘a break with normal time” (Sartz, 1999: 12), consciousness forms of desire, motivation, belief and action leading to occupation and/or the redrawing of boundaries in one’s life, building an a new way of life by making a claim on an imagined world (community).

\(^{39}\) Grappling with their subjectivity in a world in which was becoming increasingly hostile to them, these marginally emplaced individuals partially and fully realised themselves in the drift east, transforming themselves through practices an individual could learn and undertake through and with others (if motivated and purpose driven to do so).
Chapter Three: Backpacker Mobilities and the Politics of Mobility.
3.1 Introduction.

Although a constant in the world of modernity, mobility has acquired a new dimension in the late modern (postmodern) context; the constant movement of images, objects, dangers, capital, ideas and people (Lash and Urry, 1994), the ‘staggering developments in communication and transportation’ (Cresswell, 2006: 20), all changing our apprehension of space, time and subjectivity (Simonsen, 2004; Thrift, 2000b). The ideology of mobility has become integral to the production of modern subjects as well as composing society itself (Kaplan, 2006); central to the structuration process both at a societal level and across time-space. While once it was inconceivable to exist without roots, that is, ‘without a domain in which to carry on its life activities, one which will ensure and provide for its existence’ (de la Blache, 1952: 52), routes rather than roots has become a defining feature of modern society; no longer bound by tradition, obligation, borders or custom. Mobility, ‘perpetually a scarce and unequally distributed commodity’ (Bauman, 1998: 87) has become a coveted value, fast becoming ‘the main stratifying factor of our late modern or postmodern times’ (Bauman, 1998: 2-3) as spatial movement is used ‘as a vehicle for and instrument for the transformation of social situations and of realizing projects and plans by travelling’ (Kesselring, 2008: 82). Where individuals hope to achieve some personal objective, project and / or aspirations, spatial mobility can be used as a vehicle to cultivate and articulate new aspects of social / personal identity.

As imagined worlds (communities) emerge and traverse the borders of the nation-state, ‘touristic’ type travel is increasing in volume and scope, where a self-induced and self-controlled mobility can give access to these worlds. While identification with these worlds might be fleeting, others will bond with the worlds they desire, moving beyond fantasy to develop relationships within it, constructing notions of mobility in their everyday lives and practice, becoming ‘a mode of social context decisive in the manufacture of subjectivity and the determination of belonging’ (Simpson, 2005: xiii). As backpackers expose themselves to their world, they might be potentially transformed, self-induced mobility becoming a ‘substantial content of the reflexively organised trajectory of the self’ (Giddens, 1991: 85). This chapter looks more closely at this imagined world (community) and the role mobility plays in its articulation, production and reproduction, drawing out its complexities and its conflicting moral, political and social overtones. Rather than boundless nomadic space that sustains unfettered mobility, this chapter recognises that the freedom to move and to have control over one’s movement is worked through wealth, power and status, race, ethnicity,
gender, class and sexuality as well as larger social, political, regulatory and judicial contexts. This chapter will investigate how backpacking has developed within a specific political, social, economic and cultural context, examining whether backpacking, like any form of tourism is a ‘privileged flow’, constitutive and a result of globalisation or whether the inhabitants of this world can reconfigure our understandings of ‘tourism’.

3.2 Ideologies of Mobility.

Mobility is a word that has become common in everyday vocabulary, politics and the social sciences, primarily noted in discussions relating to late modernity and globalisation (Urry, 2000b). As a word, it has a meaning that goes beyond contemporary society and of achieving a modern lifestyle. Its representation and ideology have become a metaphor, where ‘[m]obility as freedom--as liberty--lies right at the heart of some of the foundational ideologies of the western world’ (Cresswell, 2006: 166). As word, it has social and historical resonance and at a basic understanding, the word mobility was introduced into the English language in the 17th century. It was applied to persons, their bodies, limbs, and organs, referring to a capacity to move; used ‘inter-changeably with movement in natural sense’ (Cresswell, 2006: 20; original emphasis). To ‘mobilise’ is to organise or make mobile and to be ‘motive’ is to produce motion (Cresswell, 2002), our primary natural advantage as a species being mobility. These generic ‘mobilities’ include various kinds and temporalities of physical movement, ranging from standing, cycling, moving your hand, climbing, alpinism, skiing, walking and dancing, movement being ‘any displacement of the body or bodily parts initiated by the person himself or herself” (Seamon, 1979: 33). A social change in its usage occurred in the 18th century as mobility (later shortened to the mob), from the Latin phrase mobile vulgus described a ‘moveable and excitable crowd’. While movement appeared to refer to an abstract and scientific conception, mobility was thoroughly socialised with negative meaning and became the opposite of ‘stable’.

While one could express oneself through work and emotional life, the very idea of nomadism was associated with rootlessness and was characterised as chaotic, unstable and threatening, ‘in the sense that moving things are often chaotic in the way we experience them’ (Cresswell, 2006: 6). Only those who were forced to move or those privileged few with technical, social, cultural and economic potential moved over distance. In medieval times, Zygmunt Bauman writes in his text ‘Post-modern Personal Patterns’, that ‘with the exception of sailors, merchants, wandering monks or soldiers, very few dared
to go outside city walls or borders of their villages in which they lived from the day they were born till their last moments – always watched by the same people and with the same people to watch’ (Bauman, 1993a). Society was seen as a natural-given institution, which granted man a particular place, ‘which was mandatory, but in return offered a sense of security and cohesion’ (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2008: 65). Bonß and Kesselring (2001) label this form of mobility as ‘traditional’, given it was pre-technological, associated with duty and obligation and included spatial movement for work, religious, scientific and military reasons (c.f. Urry, 2002). Lasting until the 18th century, what followed in the first half of the 19th century is what Bonß and Kesselring (2001) call a period of ‘territorial’ mobility, corresponding to the emergence of nation-states and the social use of the adjectives ‘domestic’ and ‘foreign’. Thirdly, in the late nineteenth and the twentieth century, a period Bonss and Kesselring call ‘globalized’ mobility, movement spread beyond national boundaries and evolved side by side with domestic movement. Finally, they argue the contemporary period is characterised by mobility beyond space and time through time-space compression; a period they call ‘virtualized’ mobility, typified by the use of telecommunications.

Exploring mobility over the ages, scholars such as John Urry, Nigel Thrift and Tim Cresswell argue that societies have always been composed of complex mobilities, but rather than shifts in block periods, there was a gradual move from the Middle ages to the Renaissance, which saw individuals break from the institutional order in discrete phases or bursts, its more recent phase enhanced by the new technologies of transport and communications that have intensified the global movements of people, goods, ideas, information and cultural practices. Throughout this gradual change, there was a departure from a pre-individualistic existence to one in which the individual ‘has full awareness of himself as a separate entity’ (Fromm, 1942/2001: 42), mobility becoming something individuals could grasp and address the world with, at least in a western context, coming to be associated with freedom, autonomy and independence (Kaplan, 1996). As more persons and groups deal with the realities / fantasies of movement, people increasingly aspire or know how / what it means to live and dwell in various mobilities, technologies extending the space of the body, displaying it across, over and through space, allowing for full communicative, imaginative, virtual, physical mobilities. Even the relative stabilities of work, friendship, family and community now require mobility across time-space as modernity both demands and facilitates mobility (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2005).
As sets of discourses, technologies, institutions and practices bring new worlds into material and social reality, individuals are increasingly using mobility to seek the attendant social relationships and encounters that such mobility yields. It does seem ‘modern society is a society on the move’ (Lash and Urry, 1994: 252) as technologies for physical mobility combine with ‘ideologies of mobility’. There are those who even suggest that that unparalleled levels of mobility are shaping a ‘post-societal' world of extreme individualisation in which nation-states and civil societies are being replaced by global 'citizens' moving endlessly through worldwide 'networks and flows'. Ali (2010) for example argues that in Dubai ‘there is no such thing as society’, its limitless consumer culture attracting people from all over the world. In a system where all foreigners in Dubai (up to 90 percent) are deliberately transformed into temporary citizens, they suffer from ‘permanent impermanence’, since they are not allowed to engage, as citizens in political or social affairs, risking expulsion. He argues that Dubai is the wet dream of global market fundamentalism, an authoritarian state governs a market society for ‘rootless, non-participatory consumers-inhabitants’. Critics argue that a degree of personal mobility is fundamental at an individual level for everyday life (going to work or to the shops, driving children to school), and a key building block in composing societies, unbounded movement creates geographically fluid identities where inequalities of mobility arise. While mobility is not a new phenomenon, driven by trade and economic needs, colonisation and other political circumstances and sometimes as a result of force or natural disaster, it has remained an elusive theoretical, social, technical and political construct (Cresswell and Uteng, 2008a, b) when applied beyond society and the nation-state. The transformation of ‘social as society’ to ‘social as mobility’ (Urry, 2000a: 2) remains an elusive and slippery object of study but as the social becomes characterised ‘by streams and mobilities’ (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2008: 19). Such streams offer a means for researchers to examine social life that is as much organised around mobilities than fixed locations or territorially bounded communities and even states.

Harvey’s (1990) concept of ‘time-space compression’ has become the primary metaphor to illustrate ‘movement and communication across space’ (Massey, 1993: 59) as new technological and communication innovations shrink the globe, compressing the time taken to communicate and travel (implying a stretching out of social relations). It is a reality in which distance and time no longer appear to be major constraints to human activity, a reality reflected through concepts such as the ‘rise of the network society’ (Castells, 1996), ‘time-space annihilation’, ‘primacy of real time’, ‘deterritorialization’ (Deleuze and Guattari,

The increased speed and scale of movement, the reduced costs and transmission times of transportation and communications has seen individuals produce new socialities and cultural forms of various kinds at a local level to the global. Even though travel time budgets have not changed substantially, disposable incomes in Western Europe and the United States have increased substantially, airfares when measured in real terms at a lower per unit cost (Schafer, 2000). As spatial movement attains a wider sense of purpose for what it yields, spatial movements have encouraged a ‘new series of social encounters, interactions and patterns of production and reproduction as well as consumption’ (Hall, 2005b: 95), structuring new linkages and connections between people, technologies and place, within and across borders. However, the ‘effective rejection of any territorial confinement’ (Bauman, 2000: 11) is largely available only to those ‘high up’ that have the ‘freedom to choose where to be’ (Bauman, 1998: 86), travelling through life ‘by their heart's desire’ (Bauman, 1998: 86), picking whatever world or destination they desire. Where mobility barriers have been lowered by political, technological and financial changes (Hannam, 2009), individuals are increasingly challenged to address the short falls and located specificities of their globalist dreams (cf. Tsing, 2005). Individual’s that do start to convert that desire might be exploited, where their mobility is forced, coerced or hindered, their exclusions or exploitation often ‘spatial’ or ‘mobility’ related (i.e. human trafficking).

Recent (2010) articles about Afghan minors travelling to Europe highlight (just as many Mexicans seek to travel North to the United States) how hard won mobility may mean actively and practically evading capture, their experiences of dislocation and exclusion

40 There has been some misreading between the terms compression, distanciation and convergence. Time-Space compression was used by David Harvey (1989) to describe the speed-up in the pace of life; the overcoming of spatial carrier meaning the world seems to collapse inwards. Time-Space distanciation is used by Anthony Giddens (1990) to refer to the stretching of social systems across space and time while time-space convergence is used by Donald Janelle (1969) to describe the decrease in the friction of distance between places. Time-space compression is thus both an outcome and a cause for distanciation (Kellermann, 2006).

41 http://tinyurl.com/ykzjxex / http://tinyurl.com/yd82f46
highlighting how the imagined worlds they desire are also complex and diverse, their mobility both creative and transgressive. Since the act of moving is ‘reflected in and constructed through different bodies’ (Cresswell, 2004: 176), their desires will probably meet the hard boundaries and borders of life, given they have no passports or resources to back up their mobility. Their bodies are immediately identifiable and often forced to submit to refugee camps, squats and detention centres, their world with all its possibilities, demands, opportunities and constraints constituting migrant subjectivities. Like other worlds, their movement is (at least initially) experienced with others at places known to be significant, the socially constructed mobility and the repetitions of bodily performances in time-space habituating into ‘a stable investment of meaning’ (Adey, 2009: 72). As people are ‘moving on rather than settling in’ (Sennett, 2006: 2), increasing numbers of people are constructing mobility in their everyday life, people drawn into distinct new worlds (Morley, 2000), spawning mobilities that are culturally-influenced. Once desired and affirmed by individuals through action and practice, mobility fantasies can potentially be converted into socio-culturally constructed space, where the lived body ‘has access to the world‘ (Brown and Perry, 2002).

These worlds can exist beyond business and economic linkages to include social and cultural connections as individuals imagine themselves as bound by a common interest, investment, attachment, object, idea, aspiration, project, event, obligation or commitment. From the ‘Kiss Army’ (fans of the band Kiss), ‘Twihards42‘ to the community surrounding the Burning Man43 festival, worlds are often explored through imaginative or virtual mobility, but it is the level of the ‘body’ through which individuals are (collectively, productivity, practically) actively involved in the world (Pons, 2003), exposing oneself to live corporeal sensual encounters. For Appadurai, this doesn’t mean a constant or proximate face-to-face community in a traditional sense, but a world (community) whose presence we can experience in a material embodied, sensory manner where bodily acting, feeling, moving, doing, touching and seeing (Dann and Jacobsen, 2002) provides the fundamental mediation point between thought and the world. These worlds are not entered alone (or resources) as individuals with the same expressive intention move over similar terrain to symbolic sub-spaces (Bourdieu, 1984) and is predicated on taking up a role that articulates a way of being-in-the-world, the lived experience located within a mid-point between mind.

---

42 Fans of the Stephanie Meyer books and movie adaptations journey through sites in America and Canada mentioned in the books and locations where filming took place. The town of Forks, Washington State, where the books were set, has seen an influx of visitors, while enterprising entrepreneurs have opened up Twilight themed accommodation, tours and cafes (http://tinyurl.com/m4az8by).
43 Burning Man is an annual art event and temporary community based on radical self expression and self-reliance in the Black Rock Desert of Nevada (www.burningman.com)
and body (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Such worlds were traditionally centered on the imagined boundaries of the nation state, because, the state was an idea ‘in the form of mental structures and categories of perception and thought’ (Bourdieu, 1998: 40). 'Key sites, texts, exhibitions, buildings, landscapes' (Urry, 2007: 262) had to be seen, touched, talked about and shared, journeys structured around facilitating performing this space. Seen as somewhat fixed containers, movement was conceptualised as stable state, ‘sedentarism’ locating bounded and authentic places or regions or nations as the fundamental basis of human identity and experience (and as the basic unit of research). While often the articulation of an official mind, these worlds were made up of particular activities, people, objects and events that were seen as significant, enacted through bodily encounters and involving the situatedness of the body and its active production of space (metaphorically and materially).

Today, individuals are looking outwards beyond the nation state, beyond places sometimes termed destinations (or nations) and representing what is usually termed ‘tourism' (Theobald, 2005: 468-9). After the ‘linguistic turn’ in the social sciences, it is possible to conceive of various social and political institutions as imagined places, and worlds, the imagination expanded to explain the constitution not only of nations but everything from families, ethnic groups, streets, regions (Friedman, 1994) to all of social reality itself, including space. While collective imagination and desire might be a powerful force, it operates not only through the written text such as the newspaper or the novel (Anderson, 1983) but also through a variety of different media, which is a vast field of collective experience. As mobility becomes ‘a structuring dimension of social life and of social integration’ (Kaufmann, 2002: 101), these worlds might involve travel, interactions, and communicative practices, which function to weave a sense of ‘togetherness’ and ‘connectedness’, mobility (and what it offers) enabling individuals access to a life project (or trajectory) across time-space and move beyond mere fantasy. While some worlds can broadly constitute cultural affiliations that favor ethic, racial, or language group (cf. O’ Reilly, 2000, Andrews, 2005 on the British in the Spanish Mediterranean coast), individuals ‘reading the world’ and its underlying political, economic and social structures can cut across ethic, racial and national lines, as they recognise themselves in worlds beyond

---

44 There are two competing hypotheses regarding globalisation, the first being that it might prompt reactionary movements, the ‘denationalization of the state’ (Bauman, 1990) reinforcing parochial distinctions. Featherstone (1995: 91) notes increased cultural flows will not necessarily ‘produce a greater tolerance and cosmopolitanism’. The second and alternative hypothesis suggests that globalisation strengthens cosmopolitan attitudes, where complex transnational movements (peoples, images, knowledge) given rise to hybrid discourses and identities that weaken the relevance of ethnicity, locality or nationhood as sources of identification.

45 Bauman (1992) argues post-modern self-identity is displacing social class as a key point of identification, where class relationships
their national state (and its constitute parts), making ‘autobiographical narrative possible’ (Freudendal-Pedersen, 2008: 20). These ‘imagined worlds’ (Appadurai, 1996) are often represented in very desirable and seductive terms (in movies, myths, stories, images), even if they are as much fantasy as real, actual movement becomes a structuring element for collective and individual action, where movement and proximity with people, places, objects or events are seen to be significant, conditioning the way individuals think and interact with the world, often ‘reflexively understood by the person in terms of her or his biography’ (Giddens, 1991: 53). As each world has its own logic, corporeality intersects with mobility so that people can satisfy their desires in respect to worlds at ‘location rather than their present one, and to the extent that these other locations are capable of satisfying such desires’ (Cresswell, 2006: 28). As individuals perform space, embodied encounters with particular people, objects, places and events can generate ‘touristic’ type networks, infrastructure and commodities, the multi-sensuous ‘doing’ exceeding the boundaries of the imagination to become written, visible, mapped and often labelled. Inter-subjective within these worlds becomes a performance through which ‘we make statements about ourselves and acquire status’ (Pooley and Turnbull, 2005: 15), offering the possibility for agency and transformation and the construction of individual biographies.

3.3 Backpacker Mobilities.

I have argued for the use of imagined worlds (communities) when approaching backpacking, a world comprised of individuals with the necessary need, belief, desire and motivation, who seek an articulation of themselves as participants in a particular world, moving beyond fantasy to look and feel part of this world because of what this world can offer. In the 1980’s, during an intense period of ‘time-space compression’ (Harvey, 1985), backpacking was one of many new opportunities that replaced societies too homogenised and commercialised to form the basis of individualising cultural practices. As individuals became increasingly freed from societal assigned roles and identities, they became free to ‘articulate to themselves and to others a sense of identity which may be autonomous from traditional status groups’ (Bocock, 1992: 153), the effects of globalisation, the collapse in both cost/space and time/space and global media ensuring that individuals had ‘access to experiences ranging in diversity and distance far beyond anything they could [otherwise]

have been increasingly overshadowed by lifestyle affiliations.

46 Appadurai (1996: 31) argues that ‘the imaginary’ as a social practice: ‘No longer mere fantasy (opium for the masses whose real work is somewhere else), no longer simple escape (from a world defined principally by more concrete purposes and structures), no longer elite pastime (thus not relevant to the lives of ordinary people), and no longer mere contemplation (irrelevant for new forms of desire and subjectivity), the imagination has become an organized field of social practices, a form of work (in the sense of both labor and culturally organized practice), and a form of negotiation between sites of agency (individuals) and globally defined fields of possibility’.
achieve' (Giddens, 1991: 169). These ‘individualised individuals’ (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002) sought control over their body, image, authentic self and life course as they found they could no longer be detached from collective imaginations, the individualised mentality thriving in countries with globalised cultures. The 1980’s were a period where the countercultural imagination reignited and thrived, its worlds offering primarily young people the opportunity to break away from their traditional class-based identities. These breaks were not as disjunctive as those who left home in the 1960’s, the worlds available often re-packaged but still couched in terms of temporal, social and spatial distance and offering to help individuals trace a more authentic, radical, truer self. From the New Age Travellers, who re-imagined a mystical rurality and travelled from festival to festival to the thousands who travelled to illegal raves in the British countryside, ‘reflections about their immediate situation, opening up a wider range of future alternatives for their imaginations to consider and transmogrify into both fearful and desirable possibilities for their own lives’ (William James47 quoted in Green, 2006: 314).

The reigniting of the countercultural imagination created movements with varied intensity, purpose and scale (Gustafon, 2006), where desire was ‘linked to mobility, not to a place’ (Bauman, 2002: 241), where bodily movement was put to work with and through others, often beyond national borders and societies, where these worlds and the subject who inhabited them flowed into each other ‘through the body that provides the living bond with the world’ (Tilley, 1994: 14). A ‘medium of exchange’ rather than a container, I argue that backpacking is one such world, a field of possible actions that offers a personal (reflexive) project (Kaufmann, 2002), a world long associated with time and movement flexibility, with goals pertaining to a form of (sub)cultural capital (Thornton, 1996, 1997). It is a world that became attractive in the late 1980’s and 1990’s, part of the larger trend towards ‘restless mobility’ of societies (Richards and Wilson, 2004a), a ‘new world order of mobility, of rootless histories’ (Clifford, 1997: 1) where meaningful movement makes sense not purely in terms of the individual experience or in terms of the historical patterns of previous journeys, but in the relationship between the two. It is a world lying very much in ‘following in the footsteps of others’, their mobility experienced through a social and cultural lens that gives it meaning (Dourish et al, 2007). Mobility structures this world, encounters and therefore the social; ‘[w]hen we travel, how we travel, who we travel with, what we travel for and how often we travel all impinge on the constructions of the self and on identity with

47 William James (January 11, 1842 – August 26, 1910) was a pioneering American psychologist and philosopher.
people and places’ (Pooley and Turnbull, 2005: 4).

Rather than positioning backpacker mobility between the oscillating continuum ‘of the traveller and the tourist’ (Bærenholdt et al, 2004: 127), I argue that in their movements and their relationships with people, places and objects is where ‘social life is created, produced and reproduced’ (Nielsen, 2005: 53), their ‘complex affiliations, meaningful attachments and multiple allegiances to issues, people, places and traditions that lie beyond the boundaries of their resident nation-state’ (Vertovec and Cohen, 2002: 2). How an individual moves, whom they move with and where they move is tied up with ‘considerations of being, meanings and identities’ (Morgan and Pritchard, 2005a: 29), since ‘identity is no longer a matter of occupying an already given subject position’ (Diken and Laustsen, 2001). These worlds (communities) are never imagined without others, worlds bearable only when articulated with like-minded others who bodily represent these world, enabling them to reconstruct themselves through others (Noy, 2004a) at ‘spaces of encounter’ where subjectivities are constructed, negotiated and refined. This is especially true of backpackers as various studies point out that between thirty and fifty percent travel alone48, the sharing of subjectivities providing ‘geographies of communality and continuity within which each social activities are coordinated and synchronized’ (Edensor, 2006: 537).

The meanings given to this world are well known, embedded in social imaginaries; and while bringing a level of contamination to those who positioned themselves within it in the 1960’s and 1970’s, it was recast in the nineties, stripped of much of its countercultural connotations, but continuing to ignite desire amongst a new generation of individuals to think of themselves as particular (or different kinds) of people (Desforges, 2000). The backpacker label is simply given (and taken) by those who internalise this world’s logic, who actively engage with this world by demonstrating a capacity and competence for performing it. I argue that it is not a belief in the ‘role’ per se but belief in the impression of a reality where ‘what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the context of its functional significance for the social system’ (Parsons, 1951: 25). This presentation of self means performing a role where the individual ‘must see to it the impression of him that are conveyed in the situation are compatible with role-appropriate personal qualities effectively imputed to him’ (Goffman, 1961). The label is merely a template that individuals seek to effectively impute and claim as a basis of ‘self-image’ (Goffman, 1961), a role identity

48 31.3% (Yi Huang, 2008), 33.5% (Speed and Harrison, 2004), 42% (Ballen and Slaughter, 2004) 45.2% (Pearce, 1990).
(Lefebvre, 1991a) extended to cover the practices of a subjectivity-in-progress as the individual struggles to place him or self in this world, a struggle that becomes naturalised over time in and through spatial and social practices. By incorporating and displaying ‘maps of meaning and power into the practice of their body and subjectivity as kind of masquerade, which (only) seems to be self-grounding identity’ (Pile and Thrift, 1995: 45), the label is immanent to a specific way of ‘being-in-the-world’, a sense of having positioned oneself, enabling the individual to establish a role relationship with others (family, friends) as well as to establish difference with others (tourists).

The role provides a clear orientation and direction to action while connecting with an imagined community of prior and future generations of travellers (Tuan, 1996). This role, is what Lefebvre (1991a: 15) would argue, is social life, where ‘[w]hat is faked in one sense is what is the essential, the most precious, the human, in another’, as if ‘there were no roles to play, and thus no familiarity, how could the cultural element or ethical element which should modify and humanize our emotions and our passions be introduced into life? The one involves the other. A role is not a role. It is social life, an inherent part of it.’ As ‘dreamscapes of anticipation’ (Baerenholdt et al, 2004) get converted, individuals will use ‘particular scripts, costumes and props’ (Shaffer, 2004: 140), travel anticipation ‘tied into an imagination and performance which enables tourists to think of themselves as particular sorts of person’ (Desforge, 2000: 930). They read the guidebook, research routes, save money, do overtime, get vaccinations and buy visas, plane tickets and insurance. Friends, colleagues and family are told, resignation letters are sent, sabbaticals applied for, university referral forms posted and going away parties organised. Mobility is already central to their narratives, as they begin to re-invent themselves and communicate their subjectivity in progress, their mind and body made ‘global ready’ and fit to travel (Germann-Molz, 2006a). Those exposed to this world through movies and television mean these ‘scripts are easy to catch’ (Jansson, 2007: 18). To embrace a role is to embrace and disappear completely into the virtual self, in terms of the image and to confirm expressively one’s acceptance of it, ‘playing it with verve and an admitted engagement of all his faculties’ (Goffman, 1969: 106), highlighting how ‘we settle ourselves in the world and the position our bodies assume in it’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1964: 52). I agree with Bell (1999:3) who

49 Automobility and other mobility cultures such as cycling, skateboarding are also governed by practices and performances that are subject to directions, a stage (infrastructure), characters (policemen, traffic wardens) and multiple scripts. Automobility, Nayar (2009: 162) argues is governed by ‘scripts’ such as ‘road signs that tell you where to go or park, the speed you can drive at, the directions for walking or particular destinations, the prohibitions ….the transactions—we can call them conversations—between the vehicles on the road (and sometimes abusive exchanges between drivers) and the choreographies of pedestrians, different kinds of vehicles and structures’. 
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argues that individuals do not ontologically ‘belong’ to the world or any group, arguing that ‘[i]dentify is the effect of performance, and not vice versa’, and being in the this world, the practice and performance of a backpacker role offers an self-identification and an alternative way of being-in-the-world, which 'knows' itself by virtue of its active relation to its world (Haldrup et al, 2008; Thrift, 1996). The practice and performance of this world requires displacement in discursive space, the world operating as a ‘liminoid space’ (Turner, 1969), travel providing liminal distance between old and new, as individuals turn their backs ‘on clock-time and routine activities of everyday life’ (Elsrud, 1998: 323). A ‘liminoid’ phase (Turner, 1978) is characterised by phases of separation, passage (liminality) and reconnection (incorporation) where there is an annulment of the old 'social contract' and demolition of the status quo to give way to a new society.

Adopted from the Van Gennep book - The Rites of Passage (1909/1960), Shields (1991: 83) argues that liminality can occur not only when people are in transition from ‘one culturally defined stage in the life-cycle to another, but also during ‘moments of discontinuity in the social fabric … moments of ‘in-betweeness’, of a loss of social coordinates'. While society is not going through a period of flux as seen in the 1960’s, Mills (1973) and Schechter, 1980) describes those who entered this world in the 1970’s as entering for a myriad of reasons. Individuals desired this world not only because of disappointment with society and politics, a counterforce to ‘war, aggression, competition, death-machinery’ (Schechter, 1980) or disappointment with personal issues (family breakdown, university50) but also because of the discourses of freedom and authenticity that surrounded this world. Today, many backpackers are at the verge or in the middle of a transition phase from one world to another including many older individuals who are negotiating a disruption of life biographies including those facing ‘fateful moments’ which Giddens (1991: 113) describes as those times when ‘events come together in such a way that an individual stands, as it were, at a cross roads in his existence; or where a person learns of information with fateful consequences, where the individual ‘must launch out into something new, knowing that a decision made, or a specific course of action followed, has an irreversible quality, or at least that it will be difficult thereafter to revert to the old paths (Giddens, 1991: 114). While many enter this world between school and university, others travel after deaths in the family, divorces, marriage break-ups, career breaks/changes, workplace arrangements, retirement, health scares, redundancy, sabbaticals or post-

50 Like the Beats, many young people dropped out of college, universities, schools, families and careers, heeding the call from Leary to ‘Tune in, Turn on and Drop Out’.
military service. While alienation from one's homeland has been eclipsed by fateful moments or periods of transition (life-changes), this world is seen as a means to 'get distance' from former lives and identities they share with others and to rebuild a purer and more 'authentic' individualised identity in collaboration with others (Maoz, 2007a).

As identity becomes the main source of meaning, people are organising 'their meaning not around what they do but on the basis of what they are, or believe they are' (Castells, 1996: 3). Few admit to having entered this world for a quest for leisure and entertainment (a good show), or a status marker (Bruner, 2001), since this world, if one were to play it competently, requires a significant investment and retains a significant influence in the construction of self-identities (Desforges, 2000). It would be wrong to compare or contrast this world with place-based units such as 'home', 'work' and 'holiday', or home geographies and 'everydayness' (MacCannell, 1976/1999; Lengkeek, 2001; Suvantolá, 2002; Urry, 1990), or see backpacking as a 'no-work, no-care, no-thrift situation' (Cohen, 1979: 181) and a 'pretend life' (Frändberg and Vilhelmsen, 2003: 1755). While the routines and regulations of everyday life can be avoided (Rojek, 1993), like the pilgrim, the backpacker can 'undergoes a number of transformations, in which previous orderings of thought and behaviour are subject to revision and criticism and unprecedented modes of ordering relations between ideas and people become possible and desirable' (Turner and Turner 1978: 3 in Mason, 2002: 95). Backpacking is an opportunity leave routines behind (student, son, employee, husband, wife) through the considerable interactions, commitments, obligations and negotiations that this world demands of them and to which many give wholly. Goffman (1961) notes a dominant role is maintained by 'audience-segregation', so that family, friends and employers do not figure, at least physically (out of sight, out of mind) in the world. Even though each individual is involved in more than one system or pattern, having several selves, a member of multiple worlds, individuals will 'manifestly' participate in this world, which means holding in 'abeyance' involvement in all others (Goffman, 1961), enacting them only under specific conditions. Backpackers are not free-floating individuals, but are tied into a network of regulations, conditions, provisos and obligations, tied up 'with caring, guilt, responsibility and negotiation as such as with individual choice' (Larsen et al, 2006: 261), many individuals under greater obligation to be
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51 Alheit (1994) identified how social actions and human behaviors are mediated by time and space, and once rhythmic regularity is disrupted (i.e. by divorce), it may mark a new phase in life. Equally, events, such as the advent of illness, war or unemployment can potentially causes instability.
'reachable’ and to ‘stay in touch’ (Jansson, 2006), not only virtually, since obligations might involve encounters with particular events, places and people seen as important to those worlds and its members. While backpackers will outwardly express ambivalence about family, friends, work and religious obligations, individualisation does not mean an ‘unfettered logic of action, juggling in a virtually empty space’ (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002: 2); since they are simultaneously part of these other worlds and subject to demands, controls and constraints when searching for ‘objective’ and ‘existential’ authenticity (Wang, 1999).

These other worlds will be carried as dispositional traces and ‘the heritage of habits which individuals have internalized in their past socialization’ (Lahire, 2003: 346). I am not arguing that all those who enter this world will undergo transformation or even consciously seek it, as many buy into a temporary commodification of difference and otherness that is neither permanent or long lasting, their socialisation less intense because of a lack of time and inability to withdraw from economic necessity. I argue that this world is one of many that can answer the question posed by David Harvey (1996: 247), when he asked: ‘[w]ho are we and to what space/time do we belong?’. However, it is a world that is only available to those who can afford to access it, produced and given meaning within relations of power. The very act of performing it separates the mobile and the relatively immobile, as bounded individuals who might imagine themselves beyond their locality are often unable to position themselves as part of it. While the majority of the worlds population are excluded, detached or ‘adrift’ in a sea of various scapes (Ng, 2005: 279), western society provides the possibility and incentives to enter this world, from ones’ passport to deferred university place, but only on the premise that inhabitation is episodic and not a lifelong or permanent choice. It is important therefore to examine the politics of backpacker mobility, to differentiate the ‘power of mobile and nonmobile subjects’ (Ong, 1999: 10-11), since the ‘[t]he power to determine the corporeal mobility of oneself or of others is an important form of power in mobile societies’ (Urry, 2002: 262).

3.4 The Politics of Mobility.

Law (1999: 583; original emphasis) suggests, the ‘practices and meanings related to mobility should not detract us from the politics of mobility’ and especially how ‘mobility and
control over mobility both reflect and reinforce power’ (Massey, 1993: 61-2). Given the normative expectation of a long, complex and spatially extended journey, those who participate in this world will encounter varied legal and social systems of different jurisdictions, as well as various transit points (airports, bus stations) that are generally governed by restriction and regulations. Backpacking depends on these regulations, agreements and institutions to work, their movement organised at various scales from the global through to the national and local, involving enabling organisations (and agreements) to more local enabling agreements (Neumayer, 2006). While ‘[r]egulating the various forms of transnational mobilities is becoming one of the vital tasks of contemporary governance’ (Aas, 2007: 287), it is not simply about who moves and who does not. Massey (1993: 61) argues it ‘is about power in relation to the flows and the movement’ as ‘[d]ifferent social groups have distinct relationships to this anyway differentiated mobility: some are more in charge of it than others; some initiate flows and movement, others don’t; some are more on the receiving-end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it’ (ibid, 61).

3.4.1 The Counterculture: Rising in the West and Setting in the East.

Drifters sought to represent the world as they thought it should be, their cultural and sexual mobilities inscribed onto their bodies; an outward manifestations of mobility made visible through their often malnourished look, ragged clothes, jaundiced skin, drug use and vagrancy (Lavie, 1984, 1991; Neville, 1970) as well as their cafes, enclaves and hotels. While their capacity to transgress the ‘everydayness’ of modern life was a marker of opposition to the establishment (Gair, 2007), their appropriation of free space for ‘creative, generative, bodily practices’ (Simonsen, 2004: 49) was seen by cultural theorists as re-performing the perversions of colonisation, the imposition of countercultural values partly leading to their eventual vilification. Skeggs (2004: 49) notes how ‘[m]obility and control over mobility both reflect and control power’, the drifters ability to transcend spatial barriers and project themselves onto space, resting on prevailing global power structures. Their movement reinforced the inequitable links between the west and the third world (Duffy, 2002; Nash, 1977) since their mobility was backed by the ‘protection of a powerful state ready to intervene on his behalf or repatriate him if necessary’ (Adler, 1989: 1381). Drifters came from those countries with a strong counter-culture sustained by white, middle-class westerners in a period of both affluence and societal flux, their drift east a privilege of those already in a position to ‘move’ (Martinez, 2003).
Newspaper reports in the early 1970’s directed blame towards this world and those within it for the spread of narcotics, venereal disease and moral decay. An editorial in the Moroccan paper, La Depeche declaring in 1970 that ‘[w]hether they are called beatnicks, hippies or anything else, they show the same signs of decay and moral decrepitude. All they bring with them are a noticeable rise in drugs, of and dangerous diseases, particularly venereal ones, and the degradation of the better local customs…..We must stop taking in strays: to be a cesspool for others was never our destiny’ (Irish Times, 1979: 7\cite{54}). De Santana (1974: 6) wrote in the Irish Times\cite{55} Newspaper that the ‘hippies infest the beaches for which Goa is justly famous, flaunting their nudity before the natives, and openly smoking pot, or shooting dope. On moonlit nights the hold sex and drug parties on the sands, and bemused Goan spectators are educated in the ways of the counter-culture’. Giving free reign to their countercultural imagination, the Indian Prime Minister who had called hippies the ‘children of India’ soon wished them to leave (Tomory, 1996: 26-27), their practices by the standards of the day characterised as ‘anti-social’ (drugs, nudity, promiscuity, begging, disease, prostitution, opening small businesses and congregating in public spaces) and by 1968, the Times of India newspaper referred to a ‘sinister pattern behind the hippie invasion’ (Sharma, 2000). With much credence given to the stereotypical image of the drifter/backpacker as an ‘unkempt, immoral, drug-taking individual’ (Scheyvens, 2002a: 145), newspapers and governments across the world began to denounce hippies, one report by Peter Wiley\cite{56} (1971) recounting how European hippies in Afghanistan were ‘begging like dogs’. The label ‘hippie’ began to be used derogatively by locals (Hitchcock and Putra, 2007) and while many drifters were proud of their negative reputation (Sobocinska, 2008) since it reaffirmed the values of this world, it also drew the attention of the authorities, the excess of bodily expressiveness now labelled deviant. The drifters had no effective vehicle to fight back or reframe arguments as most underground newspapers and zines had closed in the early 1970’s, with their own governments denouncing them and seeking them to return ans reintegrate into the societies they left (Neville, 1970). Their collective imagination, operating through different media in daily life such as zines, guidebooks, music, clothes and the novel, as well as linguistically\cite{57} through interaction required very little genuine connection with the people and cultures they encountered, their claims of belonging to those people, places and cultures as much imaginary as real, with

\textsuperscript{54} The Irish Times – Wednesday, August 19, 1970: 7 (http://tinyurl.com/yc6dz84).
\textsuperscript{55} The Irish Times – Thursday, October 17, 1974: 6 (http://tinyurl.com/ye2zmmf).
\textsuperscript{56} The Irish Times - Thursday, August 5, 1971: 6 (http://tinyurl.com/y9v4q3x).
\textsuperscript{57} Like the Beats, the ‘revolt was an expressive one, based upon alternative linguistic strategies intended to destabilize reality’ (Rycroft, 1996: 426) and redefine the cultural politics of everyday life.
most having few social, emotional or economic connections, the inhabitants harbouring different assumptions of what practices were ‘acceptable’

Cohen (1973) argues they were ‘made unwelcome, intimidated, ostracised or barred: they were persecuted in Goa in India while in other localities they were excluded from some catering establishments: restaurants serving them were avoided by regular customers’. Their clothes, posture, language and hair identified them, becoming symbols of moral breakdown and the potential social disorder of mobility (Cresswell, 2001b). The governments of Argentina, Greece, Italy, Singapore, Thailand and Yugoslavia asked (and often forced) young travellers to cut their hair and shave before entering the country (Neville, 1970; Wheeler and Wheeler, 2007) while French immigration officials were instructed to refuse admission to persons whose ‘unkempt clothes, shaggy hair and evident uncleanliness might be thought to offer an undesirable spectacle’ (Neville, 1970: 163). Munich police confiscated sleeping bags, Amsterdam workmen hosed benches around the Dam Square, while in London and Rome, the hippies were driven from the Eros fountain at Piccadilly and the Spanish steps in Rome as Police Forces penalised drifters for drugs and harassed them for nudity, sleeping rough and vagrancy (Neville, 1970; Sharma, 2000). The emergence of transnational spaces like the Haight-Ashbury and the Dam had challenged the spatial commitment and sovereignty of the nation-state (Ferguson and Gupta, 2002), who still held a monopoly on representing political and economic interests as well as geographical claims, the ways in which any world is conceived, experienced, and represented always conditioned by politics.

The governments of Crete, Israel, Thailand, Morocco, Laos, Pakistan, Italy, Germany, Spain, Tanzania, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Taiwan and France imposed entry restrictions and stricter laws for drug possession, drug smuggling, public nudity, beach sex and hitchhiking. Many countries like Pakistan ‘banned them’ while Thailand and Spain deported them en mass. It was not simply their mobility but their performed immobility, their renewed attempt at utopia building in places like the Sinai and Goa (Lavie, 1984; Odzer, 1995) that threw up many of the same issues and negative attention that the urban enclaves had produced in the west. This world could only have emerged in this period, the societal flux in the west crucial as particular social structures dissolved, having consequences for the lived practice of the collective and individual life of tens of thousands

58 The fountain was turned up to splash the surrounding steps to stop people sleeping in its vicinity.
of young people proceeded to inhabit a new world, developing a range of flawed practices (drug use, nudity), which over time evolved in relation to spatial movement, the exceptional nature of the drift east evolving into world wide phenomenon. However, this world emerged when there was still a long standing distaste and suspicion of mobility, their world coming to seen as generating ‘a threat, a disorder in the system, a thing to control’ (Cresswell, 2006: 26) which modern states have set about ‘ordering and disciplining’ (ibid, 26).

Governments and borders rendered the drifters out of place, borders turned into ‘territorializing machines’ (Grossberg, 1997). The vast majority of freaks and hippies returned to their homelands59, to societies that were now ambivalent to their ‘alternative’ way of life as an international oil crisis hit, the collapse in the global economy and western currencies denting the desirability of this world and the ability of young people to access it. Geopolitical events, travel advisories, visa changes, viruses, war and oil spikes affected and continue to create ‘unexpected and unpredictable factors and events’ (Cuthill, 2007: 65), highlighting that the this world is never a fixed entity but always at the mercy of the unforeseen events and external regulation.

### 3.4.2 The Politics of Mobility: The Nation State.

The drift east resonated through the media because it was initially constituted as an act of rebellion (an intellectual revolt) against social hierarchy, familial responsibility and home centered lifestyles (Creswell, 1993; Meyrowitz, 1985), their celebration of freedom, economic independence, unconventional leisure, play and pleasure resonating and recycled until it once again began to draw larger numbers in the 1990’s. However, this world remained imagined in a particular way by journalistic and political actors, the radical disjuncture it caused between the needs of the tourism industry, labour markets and the drifters unsettling dominant interests so much, that it only slowly became rearticulated and rehabilitated through touristic discourse and the tourism-industrial complex (Salazar, 2006). This was not an overnight change as this world was tacitly ignored, or at worst actively discouraged until the mid-nineties by governments and even some tourism planners (Cohen, 1973; Erb, 2000; Hampton 1998; Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995; Scheyvens, 2002a) due to the continuation of ‘some-what prejudicial attitudes’ (Hampton, 1998).

Brabazon (2005: 94) points out ‘it is difficult to wash the mobile body of prior cultural
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59 McDowell (1994: 413) notes that the Beat movement ‘simultaneously reflects and challenges hegemonic cultural values’ in large part because in principle, leaving home as a form of rebellion requires a home from which to leave, life in some worlds not indefinitely sustainable. McDowell documents how many of the Beats episodically returned home or to the homes of those who supported members of the Beat community, including Kerouac, who consistently returned to the home of his mother when road-weary.
readings’, but as conferences, academics and research papers argued that backpacking was beneficial to developing countries (Hampton, 1998; Pearce, 1990; Riley, 1988; Scheyvens, 2002a) because of the ease by which locals could serve their non-luxury needs (Weaver, 1995, 2006), countries were asked to re-open their borders. The backpackers, it seemed had thrown off any attempts to mobilise an agenda of change, their ‘individualist ideology’ not at all ‘countercultural’ in any political sense. Research by Riley (1988) and Pearce (1990) now emphasised that this world was not traversed by ‘hippies’ and ‘bums’ but now inhabited by the ‘middle class, at a junction in life, somewhat older then the earlier travellers on average, college educated, and not aimless drifters’ (Riley, 1988: 326). The politics of mobility that had closed down drifting were re-opening for backpackers in nations that were seeking to come out of recession, re-worked within ‘new or reworked representations of space and spaces of representation’ (Macnaghten, and Urry, 1998: 211), ‘revamped to cater for wider audiences’ (Featherstone, 1991: 96) and recast as an economic generator that no longer impacted negatively on public mobility.

Lifestyle entrepreneurs, governments, consultants, academics and employers now ‘understand’ this world predominantly as touristic, often flattened and made coherent in research papers, conferences and reports; their business orientation meaning such actors are less willing to accept its fluid ‘ambiguities, uncertainties and contingencies’ (Bechmann, 2004: 32). Their hope remains for a world that can be ordered, one which reduces ambivalence to eliminate everything that can not be precisely defined and classified, where any transgression outside designated norms or any wandering off script may encounter regimes of control. If a backpacker fails to deploy a passport, attempts an unauthorised crossing (Tibet, Gaza Strip), is found to be working or overstaying a tourist visa, or even exploring the ‘wrong’ side of a town, they must be managed. Often represented as a fixed mobile subject, the ‘freedom to choose, to accept or refuse, let alone impose their own rules on the game, must be cut to the bare bone’ (Bauman, 2000: 105). Providing ‘safety’ and ‘increasing mobility’ are seemingly becoming synonymous, rather than being contradictory, as intermediaries represent this world as something to be explored rather than produced, turning the world into ‘predictable, purposeful trips, origins and destinations’ (Huxley, 1997: 2) where those who regress the discursive dichotomy of work or leisure, or transgress the fixed boundaries face ‘anti-nomadic techniques’ (Foucault, 1977).

Backpackers are welcome, but only as tourists and through ‘well-directed paths for movement to flow through’ (Cresswell, 2006: 49). For example, the more visible practices of Israeli backpackers in exploiting ambiguities recently became an issue in India, where
the Indian Foreign Minister complained that they weren’t acting as tourists (Maoz, 2007a) by choosing to overstay visas, coupled with ‘alleged’ drug dealing, smuggling and business ownership. Coded as ‘bad movers’ amongst both the Indian and Israeli media, their practices have led to the establishment of safe houses and liaison officers by the Israeli Government in a bid to fight the image of ‘offensive Israelis’ in India (Eichner, 2007)\(^6\), their ‘right to mobility’ not guaranteed as the Indian government mulls reducing their visa allowance.

Stuart Hall (1993: 356) denounced the ‘trendy nomadic voyaging of the postmodern version’ as far back as 1993 to highlight how the sense of territoriality while journeying is neglected. He highlights how access to this world is dependent on particular social and regulatory forces that can restrict or regulate mobility escapes (Neumayer, 2006), the freedom for displacement conditional since nation-states have considerable power in managing mobility ‘usually at the expense of the putatively less desirable’ (Favell et al, 2006). While mobility is a powerful discourse creating its own effects and contexts, the mobilities paradigm does not celebrate a ‘mobility fetishism’, but acknowledges that nation-states have become a ‘sophisticated gatekeeper’ (Kellermann, 2006) by taking on the role of a controlling and regulating entity, ‘focusing mainly on the management of mobilities’ (Kellermann, 2006: 62) and remaining a ‘pivotal space and scale of governance and regulation’ (Hudson, 2005: 110).

There is a great deal of spatial ordering in modern society and while some individuals ‘inhabit the globe; others are chained to place’ (Bauman, 1998: 45), ‘fixed’ ‘locally tied’ and ‘bounded to place’. From visa applications, passport systems to border examinations, territories have not disappeared, but have responded and adjusted to people’s growing mobilities, regulating access and movement by enabling and/or effectively excluding or constraining many individuals from participation in backpacking and ‘foreign spaces’ (Urry, 2007), even if possessing the income, time, health and motivation to do so.

While mobility might be a global ideology enshrined in international agreements, these agreements predominantly facilitate access for Westerners to countries reliant on tourism receipts who cannot afford to impose visa restrictions, while those from poorer countries are unable to travel in the other direction. While enabling backpackers with ‘relatively gigantic purchasing power to go country-hopping for months on end’ (Alneng, 2002: 484; cf. Hutnyk, 1996), mobility is done at the expense of deterring the movement of others (Neumayer, 2006; Whyte, 2008).

\(^6\) www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3358757,00.html
3.4.3 The Politics of Mobility: Privilege and Power.

Any politics of mobility has to recognise the ‘diversity of mobilities and the material conditions that produce and are produced by them’ (Cresswell, 2001a: 20), since its easy to get caught up with romanticised meanings relating to backpacking. The conquest of spatial mobility is neither innocent nor free-floating, as ‘mobilization can no longer be thought of independently from immobilization’ (Beckmann, 2004: 84). While backpackers might be embarking on a journey of uncertainty, their displacement is voluntary, unlike those fleeing violence, famine, war and homophobia or those who cannot ‘leave their place at all, who are ruled’ (Bauman, 2000: 120), denied by law, custom and/or circumstances. For those forced to move, it might be their last chance to secure their livelihood or even lives, but their lack of control over their mobility might leave them disappointed, marginalised or exploited by mobility, suffering ‘mass deportation, imprisonment, population transfer, collective dispossession and forced immigrations’ (Said, 1993: 333). Unable to construct a world for themselves, they are kept in a ‘constant state of immobilized mobility, kept in constant motion, rootless and without rest, stripped of any agency (Martinez, 2003).

For an individual to undertake backpacking, they must have access to various ‘capitals’ (economic, physical, temporal, logistical) and overcome numerous constraints (disposable income, time, political rights, health, information and education, safety and security, location, access to transport), which limits many people’s access to this world. Only those with access to these capitals can afford a level of ‘spatial reach’, the exchange of money for temporary rights to visit a country (departure taxes, visas), money to occupy a mobile property, such as an airline seat or a seat on public transport, money to eat and money to occupy a living space such as a hostel bed, often beyond the reach of many.

However, whatever background, each individual needs to learn how to play the game, with no evidence to suggest that one class has the pre-travel knowledge or skill to be successful in this world, their capital (economic, physical, spatial, cultural, social) and the schooling in tourism that their middle class upbringing might have brought them giving them no god like knowledge of this world. They still must learn a new way of being, seeing and dwelling, internalising the ‘right’ dispositions which requires a certain knowledge, interest and belief in the game. That is not to say that all backpackers’ have equal resources, and while some utilise their family’s economic capital, others work hard to obtain the financial resources, often restricting their own everyday and routine mobility (clubbing, eating out, working
overtime) so as to enable them to enter this world. For others class and family background represent constraints, fear working to ‘restrict some bodies through the movement or expansion of others’ (Ahmed, 2004: 69), their inability to control their mobility meaning they might not even imagine themselves in this world, their world not shrinking in any discernible way (Inda and Rosaldo, 2008).

3.4.4 Politics of Mobility: Differential Mobilities.

This imagined world is entrenched within formulated understandings, discourses and the hegemony of western values, many of its participants retaining the rights to travel untrammeled ‘regardless of political regimes, terrorism, or any form of religious authoritarianism’ (Gogia, 2006: 368) but engendering their own unique differential mobilities and immobilities (Hannam et al, 2006). While ‘[d]ifferential mobility empowerments reflect structures and hierarchies of power and position by race, gender, age and class, ranging from the local to the global’ (Tesfahuney, 1998: 501), de Certeau (1988) argues that it is the body that makes movement possible and is the sphere of the production of a subjectivity, through which embodied practices of movement takes place. Merleau-Ponty (1962: 388) argues that ‘[o]ur body to the extent that it moves itself about, that is, to the extent that it is inseparable from a view of the world and is that view itself brought into existence, is the condition of possibility ….. of all expressive operations and all acquired views which constitute the cultural world’. There is a need to investigate the body, since ‘forms of embodiment … create the basis of all other varieties of capital’ (Shilling, 1993: 149). The individual’s use of ‘expressive resources - voice, gesture, movement and so on’, enable the individual to ‘construct a fictional participant in the narrative, a character, which will function as the notional author of the actor’s words and actions’ (Counsell, 1996: 3). Individuals will initially present themselves and activities to others, hoping to guide the impressions others hold of them, a process that involves individuals constructing and staging their identity. While Haldrup and Larsen (2006: 279) note that tourists ‘bring their gendered, aged, sexed and racialized bodies with them’, this world is tied to relations of power and domination that ‘both produce and shape forms of mobility that various bodies can undertake’ (Gogia, 2006: 360), a ‘resource to which not everyone has an equal relationship’ (Skeggs, 2004: 49). While I have noted how access still ‘depends very much on where and how they live, and who they already are’ (Parish, 2008: ix), there is also capital attributable in travelling the ‘right’ way and carrying the ‘right looks’, the embodied capital of gender, race, and religion read differently across the this world with the capital
attributable to certain bodies giving them greater spatial freedom. Some individuals better equipped to ‘fit in’ than others; embodied subjects ‘already marked by differences’ (Ahmed, 1998: 45), either enabling or constraining mobility and the ability to fit in different ways and contexts. Access to different worlds differs across ethnicities, genders, and sexualities and environments, and while the choice to go backpacking in any form is an expression of privilege, not all bodies move freely within this world, ‘some bodies must always negotiate the discursive structures that render [them] Other’ (Puar, 1994: 93).

Bodies that are coloured, disabled, queer, sick, obese are seen by many as ‘out of place’ and considered as malfunctioning, immobile, ‘uncontrollable and polluting’ (Imrie, 2000) by authorities and backpackers themselves, the threat of violence, racism, sexism and homophobic delimiting identification with this world. I argue that bodies define the limits of ‘subjectivities, identities and practices of encountering the world as discursive experience’ (Wilson and Ateljevic, 2007: 98), those lacking the capital embodied in the ‘body’ often subordinated because they lack the right bodily attributes, locked ‘into a position where social agency becomes extremely hard to acquire’ (Hedegaard, 2003). While they may be able to move spatially, bodies that are considered ‘out of place’ may be socially disadvantaged, the affective dimension with others vital in forming relations to this world often denied. From older to overweight bodies; it can be sometimes difficult to look but also perform the part, as the practices that surround backpacking often involve an element of risk; roughness and bodily effort. The ‘appropriate’ performance can sometimes be out of reach for some, while other who dress inappropriately may also be considered ‘out of place’ (i.e. wearing a suit, or carrying a suitcase). Men are often more mobile than women, young people more so than older travellers, single people more so than families, able bodied more that those with a disability, some individuals in more control of their mobility than others. Rather than a melting pot of different backgrounds, classes, sexualities, ages and genders sharing intimacy in fleeting encounters, textual as well as visual references to this world characterise it as predominantly white, middle-class and western. The majority of Lonely Planet guidebooks continue to be authored primarily by white men (Gogia, 2002), the output of backpacker brochures, movies and images valuing young, white, western bodies, while marginalising and erasing others (Jenkins, 2003). Indeed, the moralising guidance in guidebooks in regards LGBT and female travel may regardless of actual risks, cause more hesitation and caution (Bhattacharyya, 1997; Elsrud, 2001). I argue white, heterosexual young males retain a privileged mobility, their bodies given extra capital, while access for those with queer, lesbian, female, disabled, coloured bodies is made difficult or
denied. While some may lack the imagination, desire or motivation to enter this world, others will exclude themselves because ‘that’s not for the likes of us’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 471).

3.4.5 The Politics of Mobility: Chains of Implications.

Traditional thinking about ‘tourism’ flows is largely negative as such flows and the spaces and impacts they create are imbued with power and inequalities. As tourists do not stay at any one place long enough to produce connections, commitment or emotional nearness (Albrow, 1997; Larsen et al, 2006), their contact with more stable communities and localities are blamed for creating sites of speed and superficial consumption (Relp, 1976). From non-places (Augé, 1995), ‘pseudo-places’ (Relp, 1976), spectacle (Debord, 1977) and simulacra (Baudrillard, 1988), the consequential accounts of brute ‘touristic’ movements on place and the meanings that ascribes significance to place have been largely negative. Scholars have routinely seen the world backpackers position themselves as an alternative to the alienating affects of these movements, claiming that backpackers can enhance the quality of life for locals who are given positions within this world (Hitchcock, 1997: 94–95), their engagement providing both economic and cultural benefits (Wilson, 1997; Scheyvens, 2002a,b). Unlike tourism landscapes (i.e vacationscapes – Gunn (1989)), where much has been pre-conceived and planned so as to serve tourist needs and desires, where ‘almost nothing in them that can happen spontaneously, autonomously or accidently, or which expresses human emotions and feelings’ (Relp, 1981a: 104-105), those who position themselves in this world are characterised as placing value on ‘the people, places and cultures they traverse, without demanding the same product deliverance and ‘consumer satisfaction’ as tourists (Riley, 1988).

While the fluidly and ambivalence of this world provides openings for locals to approach and serve backpackers, backpackers themselves might only be a temporary presence in a given location, their repetitive movements very powerful over time, their ‘being, doing, touching and seeing’ (Crouch and Desforges, 2003: 7) often drawing from particular natural stages that might conflict with local uses, their knowledge of places being that of ‘outsiders’, distant from both ‘the place and from the labor that makes it’ (Mitchell, 1996: 27). Despite their ‘dalliance’ in the margins, the ‘truly marginal are kept at bay’ (Martinez, 2003: 12) as constant movement limits any particular relationship with the land, its people or its culture. The language of this world is the language of mobility, as backpackers ‘live from one attraction to attraction, from temptation to temptation, from sniffing out one tidbit
to searching for another, from swallowing one bait to fishing around for another – each attraction, temptation, tidbit and bait being new, different and more attention-catching than its predecessor’ (Bauman, 1998: 84). Each new sensation is sold through the possibility of encountering real places, people and cultures, the body ‘an attitude directed towards a certain existing or possible task’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 114). As much fantasy as real, backpackers will use space to define and realise their movements, goals and intentions, even thought they not see this world as an objective, geometric setting. This world becomes ‘a spatial and temporal frame to be filled with identity narratives’ (Elsrud, 2001: 605), their trajectories creating a ‘chain of implications’, that leaves traces (objects, symbols, names, materials) across the world from dumped cars on Sydney’s streets (Allon, 2004; Allon et al, 2008) to sexually transmitted infections (Abdullah et al, 2004; Egan, 2001).

This exploration and manipulation of space can immobilise locals when backpacker desire is sold back to them in the form of commodities, the repackaging of the Other as a ‘pleasurable commodity or feared savage’ (Bennett, 2008a) undermining host-guest interaction. While not untouched and unpolluted until impacted by ‘global culture’ (Elsrud, 2004), McRae (2003) argues that ‘[n]on-modern cultures are not allowed to progress, to grow and change. They are placed in stasis, always ready and available for ‘Western’ consumption of an imagined, nostalgic past’ because they represent ideals of freedom and self-discovery. While interactions are mapped as valuable within this world, accumulating traditions, history, representations, stories, movies, and guidebooks, it sets up a discourse where locals have to ‘articulate themselves in terms acceptable to international tourism’ requiring ‘that every player use Western language and follow Western theatrical practices’ (Bruner, 1991: 70). They learn how to ‘perform’ for backpackers, forced to try and exchange their cultural capital of their ethnic background and local knowledge with the (sub)cultural capital / social capital through ‘backpackers so as to gain a position in this world. Backpackers expect locals to ‘slide silently, talk softly, minimise intrusion’ (Edensor, 2006: 205) rather than intrude and throw boundaries of the self into question. As people and places follow the script, they become inscribed in circles of anticipation, performance, and remembrance, a process that might require ideological and cultural impositions, such as the export of notions, systems, practices, ideas and knowledge (Ling, 2003), potentially

---

61 In many cases, a symbol has been lifted out of context and appropriated by another group, mobility culture or cultural movement who have seen something of themselves in the actions, aspirations, or identities of distant others.
impacting on local inhabitants (economically, socially and culturally).

Few communities are in a position to limit change by altering and wiping clean the symbolic and material signposts that attract backpackers or assert their own subjectivities during encounters. To be mapped and written into this world can mean social, cultural and material transformation for places, since to ‘haunt a landscape is to supplement and disturb it….passing-through is at once both passing-into and emerging-from’ (Wylie, 2005a: 246), representations ‘lived as reality, informing the practices of westerners’ (Desforges, 1998: 176). From a cocaine-making factory in Colombia, the transformation of the Vietnam War into ‘a market-driven simulacrum of tourist representation’ (Bennett, 2008a), countries and locals have been nudged to fulfil the countercultural imagination (Alneng, 2002), which is then put into practice. This countercultural imagination can suit ‘dominant interests, and the dysfunctional inequities of the global order’ (Hutnyk, 1996: 126). However, I argue that the problem is not with the imagination itself or the logic of the this world, but the ‘terms and to what effects (sub)cultural capital gets exchanged and differentially evaluated’ (Pellegrini, 1997: 51).

As certain places, cultures and practices are given meaning in spatial / learning trajectories, backpackers and those that sell them the experience set the terms of exchange value, often extracting too much from real places and people. While backpackers may claim superior familiarity with people and places, this is more fantasy as real, as they move before any closeness, familiarity or ‘friendship’ can emerge. Places themselves are continually enfolded into and out of this world (withdrawn, destroyed, changed), places brought into play through organised / informal backpacker performances, ‘networked mobilities that only contingently stabilize certain places as being fit ‘for play’’ (Urry, 2004: 205). Where ‘performances can not be realized or there are contested performances’ (Urry, 2007: 261), backpackers may move on, leaving behind places and people that are no longer of ‘positive affect’ (Urry, 2007: 260). However, this world is not the faith that some researchers read into it and rather than producing consumption led ‘MacBackpackers’ (Bennett, 2005) and locals with no position in this world except as colour. Those with the necessary desire, strategic intention and resources can seek to play an active role in this world, choosing what, where, when and how to display and engage with backpackers. Little work has captured the impact of ‘deterritorialization of the imaginative resources of lived, local experiences’ (Appadurai, 1996: 52), with locals increasingly playing the backpacker game. As this world lies ‘in the minds of each lives the image of their communion'
(Anderson, 1983: 15), ‘larger and larger numbers of people live in circumstances in which disembedded institutions, linking local practices with globalized social relations, organize major aspects of day-to-day life’ (Giddens, 1990: 79). Exchange values are continually redefined as individuals find new ways to structure their experience of this world, new mediums enabling backpackers and locals to continually ‘(re-) discover themselves through a process of reflexive engagement, where hosts and tourists jointly construct each others' subjectivities (Jaworski et al, 2003).

3.5 Imagined World – Real Tourism.

Without travelling to a destination, backpacker mobility produces a touristic type world of accommodation and guidebooks, as this world is a rich terrain for touristic type narratives and performances. Like tourists, their time is this world is often limited and non-routine, the majority of backpackers entering from the centre of their societies, returning home to settle into ‘respectable’ careers upon completing their travels (Cohen, 2004: 50). The UNWTO defines tourism as comprising ‘the activities of a person travelling outside his or her usual environment for less than a specified period of time and whose main purpose of travel is other than exercise of an activity remunerated from the place visited’. It is a definition that relies on four different characteristics: time, space (distance), boundary crossing and purpose of travel (Cooper and Hall, 2008), the definition structured to exclude trips within the area of the individual’s home environment, temporary work and trips that are permanent in nature. It is a definition designed for statistical and technical use with more contemporary perspectives noting the terms ‘tourist’ and ‘tourism’ may not be able to convey the full meaning that social actors give their aspirations, and mobility related lifestyles or projects (Coles et al, 2004). More recent discussion have sought to reconnect tourism with movement, where one participates ‘in activities away from the home, and where the travel itself is at least a part of the satisfaction sought’ (Kelly, 1995: 218).

Scholars have sought to expand upon ‘touristic’ type mobility as constitute of everyday life, different worlds engendering mobility that has repercussions for life in the contemporary world. Tourism is simply the leisure-oriented catchall phrase for multiple mobilities that do not involve a permanent change of residence, stretching from surfing to mountain biking. Because the lack of means by which ‘temporary’ can be gauged or measured, touristic related mobilities are often slippery, journeying in new imagined worlds can be used to construct new, more open figurations of the subject, the proliferation of new cultural flows, modes of belonging, and practices creating increasingly complex figurations beyond the
nation-state. While not adhering to any definition, those who inhabit this world have succumbed to the appeal of the tourist, ‘the true or imaginary pleasures of a sensations-gatherer’s life’ (Bauman, 1998: 92), where mobility is equated with self-transformation and worldliness. Bauman’s tourist ‘devours the world, not being devoured by it, assimilates not being assimilated, 'domesticates' the strangeness of others, while priding himself on his own strangeness’ (Bauman, 1993a); ‘sensation-seekers and collectors of experience; their relationship to the world is primarily aesthetic: they perceive the world as a food for sensibility - a matrix of possible experiences’ (Bauman, 1998: 94).

3.6 Chapter Summary.

While some degree of mobility is fundamental to society, its role and significance has changed significantly over the last century, becoming a defining characteristic of twenty-first century society. Developing as a positive value in contemporary western society, a metaphor associated with progress, discovery, open-mindedness, exploration, renewal, transformation and escape, Bauman argues ‘we are witnessing the revenge of nomadism over the principle of territoriaity and settlement’ (Bauman, 2000: 13), individuals now travelling ‘without an idea of destination to guide us, neither looking for a good society, nor quite sure what is in the society we inhabit makes us listless and eager to run’ (Bauman, 2000: 134). A recent burst of globalisation has seen innovations and modernisation in transport, communications and information technologies, meaning easier and more frequent flows of information, people, goods, services, ideas, objects and capital around the globe. A ‘globalisation ideology’, a ‘decidedly Western construct’ (Swyngedouw, 2004: 27) has emerged as an act of faith for many individuals, groups, institutions and governments around the world who have enabled and aligned themselves within a new age of mobility by opening up their markets and borders to benefit from global flows, tourism sold as one flow seen as a ‘sure-fire’ way to economic prosperity (Bennett, 2008a,b). More ‘situated and provisional accounts of movement’ (Cresswell, 1997: 379) have slowly incorporated accounts of tourism into mobilities literature and while most spatial movements are still internal, transnational, circular and temporary, movements over long distance are increasingly common in this ‘free-market based world economy’ (Swyngedouw, 2004: 27). I have argued for the notion of imagined worlds (communities) in facilitating individual choice, where access is facilitated by imagining oneself as a backpacker, a role identity one initially clings to and invests in as an individuals positions themselves in a new world (since its non-routine). When an individual turns him/herself into
a backpacker, they turn themselves into a subject, and while that subject position is subordinated by power, it is a process through which the individual gains the position of agency as well as social existence (Penttinen, 2008).

While never abstracted from power, I argued how societal celebration of backpacker mobility replaced distrust, distaste and suspicion, the conflicting and changing representations of various mobilities ever present, where ‘mobility as progress, as freedom, as opportunity, and as modernity, sit side by side with mobility as shiftless, as deviance and as resistance’ (Cresswell, 2006: 2). Like the homeless vagabond or New Age Traveller, the discursive construction of the hippie / drifter led to their demonisation within the social / political imaginaries, one that travelled with them through their new world, the visible spatialising of a travelling culture upsetting the ‘proper’ order, their relative autonomy and performed immobility leading the media and the tourism industry to find no value in the world they were creating. However, by not facilitating their mobility and organising space for them in the west partly led to the emergence of the overland scene, leading them to develop an ideology that was frugal and anti-materialist, their stance against tourism (and vice-versa) legitimising their practices to themselves and a growing audience in the west. Forced into a marginal position, their ‘unusual, irregular or innovative counter-measures’ (Bauman, 2005: 41) were the precursor to institutionalisation (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). As the tourism industry or state instructions could neither control or profit from this world and those who positioned themselves within it, those ‘unassimilated to the emerging structures of institutional power, rejected by the established order for their intransigence and obdurate rebelliousness’ (Said, 1993: 403). Once this world, and those that represented it were labelled as deviant (Jenkins, 1996), the drifters very practice of mobility came to represent a threat to societies from which they originated and those they traversed, soon drawing judicial, political and journalistic interference (Cresswell, 2001b). Reignited by a countercultural imagination, this world have been largely transmitted intact, although partially rewritten and repositioned within touristic discourse, attaining a ‘certain cohesiveness’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 261) that ‘does not imply that it is coherent (in the sense of intellectually worked out) signs’ (ibid, 261). It is not a world you are forced or fall into, each individual influencing their own movement through time-space, mobility ‘a vehicle for creativity and self-fulfilment’ (Bonß and Kesselring, 2004). Made up of geographically dispersed individuals who are in control of their mobility, their movement is largely authorised and legitimised both by originating and traversed countries. Mobility yields the pattern of embodied encounters through which individuals perform who they believe they
have become with others, moving and engaging the world practically and thereby imaginatively by accumulating capital, whose value is only recognised in this world.

Socially and spatially exclusive, I argued it is inflected by historical, linguistic, and political situatedness (Appadurai, 1996), structured as ‘natural’ by those who inhabit it as it reflects their desires, interests and needs. While any imagined world (community), ‘regardless of the inequality … is always perceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship’ (Anderson, 1983: 15), the aged, women, the sick and the poor are often-placed in distinct ways in relation to movement (Massey, 1993), certain categories of people deemed by dominant states, service providers and backpackers themselves to be ‘risky, unprofitable, or undeserving of mobility’ (Wood and Graham, 2006: 188). Their world conceals powerful ideologies that are often beyond the grasp of an individual’s experience, their ability to take up a position depending not simply on their capacity to be mobile, but also their nationality, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, age and income, the worlds normative social, spatial, temporal dimensions requiring individuals to be bodily fit, the physicality of the body enabling individuals to imaginatively and physically inhabit this world. As a ‘radical inter-subjectivity’ (co-presence) contributes to the formation of behavioural, emotional, cognitive bonds between the individual the world they enter, those bodies considered ‘out of place’ are less able to position themselves in this world. This world is complex, especially when viewed from different angles and I argue against a clear-cut distinction or opposition between mobility or immobility, privilege or exploitation, fantasy or reality. Using the example of the counterculture, I argued that from issues of movement, of too little movement or too much, or the wrong sort at the wrong time are central to the discussion of backpacking, with mobilities (refugees, migrants, tourists) being perceived politically. I found how previously there has been a fixation with fixity, which resulted in certain forms of countercultural mobility being thought of negatively because of their association with placelessness or other ‘undesirable’ phenomena such as transience. Today, the means to and ability to move has been helped by relaxed regulations, as many countries have removed many of the legal and administrative barriers to freedom of movement, especially from those individuals from the west but spatial mobility is strongly structured by one's material, cultural and economic capital. However, nation-states remain controlled areas with defined borders where the mobility and through flow is regulated (in terms of speed, forms of access, power and amplitude).

While one could argue that it is situated within a neo-colonialist / imperialist paradigm of present day capitalist exploitation and under-development of the Third World (Hutnyk, 1996), one that inscribes mobility with conquest, control and possession, it could also be argued their mobility is reflexive, more cosmopolitan and ethnical.
Chapter Four: Research Methodology.
4.1 Introduction.

Denzin and Lincoln (2003) suggest that we have now reached the ‘Seventh Moment’ in qualitative research, as social researchers become more ‘reflexive’ in their approach, a process accelerating as academic texts and discourses are revealed as socially constructed representations (Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Hollinshead, 1999; Rose, 1997). However, tourism researchers, historically predicated to western-based epistemologies, positivistic and postpositivistic methodologies (Ayikoru, 2009; Jennings, 2007) have been slow in making any ontological, epistemological and methodological shifts towards new theoretical paradigms or blended paradigms. Urry (2007) argues that researchers must look through a mobilities ‘lens’, one that provides a multi/post disciplinary space for researchers to look beyond disciplines and make a shift that will capture a twenty-first century world of flux and mobility, the mobilities turn asking questions about a world on the move, demanding researchers cross disciplines and embrace reflexive, interpretative, participatory and critical modes of research inquiry and methodologies that are distinctly mobile. The ‘new mobilities paradigm’ (NMP), part of the ‘post-disciplinary mobility turn’ (Urry, 2007: 6) understands that social phenomena are produced and reproduced through mobility; worlds, families, nations and societies now constituted through motion and unfolding through time and space (Hall, 2009), not as something static and routine but as an everyday artful accomplishment. In order to understand backpacking, this chapter argues that researchers must adapt to new positions and beliefs so as to understand how the individual imagination gets converted into social and material reality, to focus on how people in their everyday lives ‘make sense out of, ascribe meaning to, and create a social structure of the world through a process of continual negotiation and interpretation’ (Adler and Adler, 1987: 25).

I argue that tourism researchers have not responded to experiences of mobility, often thought of as a matter of rational organisation, an important competitive feature in a global world, or as a dominant factor involved in stratification with anthropologists traditionally researching experiences of movement and dislocation because of war, famine and migration. Researchers have not responded to understand how different forms of mobilities have increased dramatically in recent decades, a ‘diverse array of forms of movement across scales ranging from the body (or, indeed parts of the body) to the globe’ (Cresswell,
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63 Echtner and Jamal (1997) define multidisciplinary as studying a topic by including information from other disciplines but still operating within one disciplinary boundary, while an interdisciplinary approach is one in which different tourism phenomena are studied by working between disciplinary perspectives, blending various philosophies and techniques so that the particular disciplines do not stand apart, but are brought together to produce a more holistic synthesis.
2010: 18) now essential for contemporary societies. In approaching the topic of backpacker mobilities, I never thought of backpacking as tourism per se, but self induced and controlled mobility. The NMP offered a basic set of beliefs, one that celebrates subjectivity and agency and recognises that various (alternative) mobility cultures or constructions exist, emerge, disappear or are recycled. While the NMP guides my worldview, it is not an inquiry paradigm and while it helped to establish the ontological (nature of knowledge / reality) nature of my study, it only suggests answers to epistemological (relationship between the knower and the known) and methodological questions (how the inquirer goes about finding out knowledge). Backpacking has been intensively studied since the early 1990’s, but there has been unprecedented interest in the last two years as mobility-related issues such as the increase in material and digital flows, the deterritorialization of borders, and the un-bounding of identities, communities and places have become central in the social sciences, backpacker mobilities (given their visibility of their transnational mobility and physical reality) an attractive area of study, ethnographies of backpacking recognising the socially constructed nature of their movement (the fact of mobility encoded culturally and socially and encoded through practice). They are also recognised as part of the landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live, another figuration amongst the people and groups who deal with the realities of wanting and having to move or the fantasies of wanting to move.

The works of Anderson (1983) and Appadurai (1990, 1996) are very evident in the first three chapters, positing global flows of people, images, technologies, capital, narratives and ideologies that crisscross national boundaries, (sometimes) disrupting notions of cultural, national and community identity that were previously seemingly stable (Aas, 2007), the (imaginary) resources of these global flows allowing people to construct a range of different cultural identities. However useful their vision, my own conceptualization of imagined worlds (communities) and the converging vision of John Urry, Tim Cresswell and others who view mobility as ‘liquidating’ social life and social relations, mobility (and mobility politics) remains under-theorised. The large amount of published material about backpacker tourism is based on ethnography or ethnographic methodology, an approach that reveals little conceptual and methodological reflection, answering few questions about how material and immaterial networks have spread within and across national borders, few researchers thinking about the reality of their mobility and reality of their movement. Ethnographic research of the phenomenon has largely dealt with motivations, social interaction, impacts and economic potential. More recent research has sought
segmentation, typologies and clusters, often using strict criteria when judging who is and isn’t a backpacker (based on age, length of journey, accomodation). As the literature review was filtered through the new mobilities paradigm (Sheller and Urry, 2006), I found large knowledge gaps about backpacking, about how it emerged and how it is sustained, and most importantly, how it is performed into being. This ‘mobility turn’, spreading into and transforming ‘the sedentarist’ (Cresswell, 2002) and ‘a-mobile’ (Urry, 2007) premise on which much social science has hinged demands new answers to ontological, epistemological and methodological questions.

Rather than adopt a non-interactive posture (stating questions or criteria in advance in propositional form and subjected to empirical tests), the overall aim of this dissertation is to learn more about how backpacking ‘works’: how it developed and continues to develop, how it is sustained, maintained and performed by backpackers themselves. By focusing on the way backpackers actually negotiate and perform their world into being through their interactions, encounters, narratives, practices and stories, this dissertation seeks to add a new layer to the understanding of backpacking by investigating how backpackers create social order in their world. Like all academic research, I seek to advance knowledge and provide a better way to understand the phenomena of backpacking. Reaching under the term, metaphor and label ‘backpacking’, the aim is not to uncover some hidden realities or an invisible, secret ideological grid; since backpacking is simply one constitute part of the global cultural economy of flows that constitutes the imagined worlds (communities) of persons and groups that move around the globe, but to investigate movement, the representations of movement that give it shared meaning and (the embodied and experienced) practice of movement. The study, given the above aims would clearly benefit from a multi-post disciplinary approach rather than a single discipline or subject area such as tourism, since it is questionable whether a positivistic approach would be sufficient for understanding the phenomena of how backpacking reproduces itself.

4.1.2 Purpose of this Study.

Conceptually, I wanted a research strategy that would generate insights into backpacking, drawing from the interaction of activity, people, practice, representations, meaning and movement to achieve an ‘ontic depth’ so as to understand geographic movement, its construction in everyday life, the meanings that such movements are encoded with (through narrative, discourse, representation) and the experience of practicing these
movements. Backpackers, those acquisition of such mobility is often analogous to a struggle for acquiring new subjectivity means they are constituted through mobility, sustaining and maintaining specific patterns of travel choice and behaviour. Since they construct notions of mobility in their everyday life and actively justify and demonstrate their belonging to a imagined world (community) through signifying practices, the very act of travel, the constructed notions of mobility fabricates their world, a world occurring within society but free from many of its constraints. By understanding their mobility, I argue, also offers a cohesive way of understanding backpacking. The research aim is to untangle and clarify this worlds’ complex nature by investigating backpacker mobilities, but rather than implement any control prior to any fieldwork, or superimpose a rigid academic criteria or agenda upon the research process, I utilise a qualitative\textsuperscript{64} approach that is naturalistic, relying on participation and interpretivism as a general philosophy. I argue for a strategy that stresses the movement, representations and practices of the subjects under inquiry, so as to generate a collage of collaborative knowledge. By ‘getting inside’ and grappling with the complexity of everyday lives that take shape and gain bodily expression in their world, my research looks to ‘shared experiences, everyday routines, fleeting encounters, embodied movements, precognitive triggers, practical skills, affective intensities, enduring urges, unexceptional interactions and sensuous dispositions’ (Lorimer, 2005: 84). It is an approach that demands reflexivity and reflection as I attempt a partial reconstruction of the practices and elements that sustain this world, usually hidden and unconscious even to the subject, but reconstructable to the researcher.

However, any approach that is ontologically relativist and epistemologically subjectivist can reshape the researcher, requiring him or her to go beyond the surface in seeking meaning in the data, searching for and questioning tacit meanings relating to movement, representations and practice. I indulge in ‘what must admittedly be recognised as the longer reflective and necessarily deeper reflexive effort that the logic of qualitative methodologies is inclined to demand’ (Hollinshead, 2004a: 67), creating a new bricolage that is always in a process of becoming. In a long and ongoing process, I interpret backpacker movement, representations and practice as well as other data such as interviews, conversations, memories, field notes, blogs, stories, literary texts, popular media, films, the daily discursive reality of backpackers and documents, so as to offer a

\textsuperscript{64} Jamal and Hollinshead (2001: 69) argue ‘\textit{r}eality as it is known is lodged in narrative texts that mediatethe real’ and truth ‘is fragile, a co-production, an interactional experience lodged in the moment that connects the reader-as-audience-member and co-performer to a performance text’ as opposed to some solid and unambiguous ‘truth’ or validity in the scientific/positivist sense.
coherent, theoretical and conceptual scaffold; producing a rich, detailed empathic and multi/post disciplinary understanding of their world, those who inhabit it and how they sustain it. In this chapter, I discuss relevant methodological considerations, the use of (social) constructivism, participatory and interpretative paradigms together with a discussion how I came to utilise a multi-paradigmatic and bricoleur methodology (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Hollinshead, 1996; Zahra and Ryan, 2005).

4.2 Backpacking Research.

Mobility is a fundamental human activity and is firstly, ‘a brute fact’ that conveys meaning as in, for example, freedom, transgression and creativity and something that is practiced, experienced and embodied so that ‘mobility is a way of being in the world’ (Cresswell, 2006), I have focused on the counterculture in relation to the (im)-mobility of people, knowledge, money, objects and the politics of the time in historical perspective so as to highlight the capacity of an embodied imagination to seek out a new life trajectory. During 1968, or what Newsweek called ‘a global season of rude awakenings’, their spatial interventions caused a crisis when funneled into politics, their practices of moving, dwelling and communicating soon becoming a concern of politicians. I argued that in a time of societal flux, individuals who had a distinct way of looking at the world came to see themselves in many different ways, but increasingly as existing in some relation to the global, and sought to reconstruct a narrative meaningful to them, constructing the most plausible world vision within which to ‘make sense’ of their lives since their countries (their ‘commonsense’ world) no longer made sense.

The drift east was the result of a countercultural imagination that was abstractive and disjunctive, since it withdrew from the given world, leading to the creation of an imagined world (community) with alternate frames of reference. I argued that this world was recycled as an alternative mobility culture, backpacking as a whole essentially a product of mobilities, their performance not only a creative practice over time-space and mode of representation but also a embodied engagement as individuals negotiate a belonging and attachment as they geographically move through cultural, social and physical space, encountering and negotiating with others in that space, the construction of mobility in their everyday lives sustaining and reproducing a lived reality. For Graham and Shaw (2009: 1447; original emphasis), the motivations for much travel today is ‘less rooted in the

individual *per se* as in the properties of social relations between people, institutions and culture. From long-distance relationships, foreign assignments, business trips, second homes (Pitkanen, 2008), increasing numbers of people, especially in the west are commuting, migrating or travelling over long distances. As people adapt to its demands, or embrace mobility, ‘It contributes to defining the fabric of our lives and is quickly becoming a formative element of existence’ (Flamm and Kaufmann, 2006: 167).

Lury (1997: 75) argues that ‘there has been an increased research interest in travelling cultures, in portable touring mobile cultures, in cultures in motion’, detached and deterritorialised from specific places and communities. For those researching such mobile cultures, they are often transitory and difficult to capture, movement ‘a most elusive theoretical, social, technical and political construct’ (Cresswell and Uteng, 2008a: 1). However, it is a construct worth investigating, given that ‘modern society is a society on the move’ (Lash and Urry, 1994: 252), various mobility streams and cultures becoming a key point of study in the social sciences, even though such streams, from migration to road cycling, are studied in a myriad of ways, contexts and disciplines. From residential mobility, migration (international and inter-regional), travel and tourism (including business travel) and day-to-day journeys (to the shops, to work, commuting), the social sciences have begun to notice that people move about a lot more (Hannerz, 1996), not at least tourists. Before the mid-1970’s, the only social scientists who had intensively concerned themselves with touristic movements were economists, rather than anthropologists, geographers or sociologists (Echtner and Jamal, 1997; Stronza, 2001).

Developing only slowly ‘beyond the narrow boundaries of an applied business fields’ (Tribe, 2005: 5), Rojek and Urry (1997: 2) identify the negative role of economics, which ‘deliberately …abstract[s] most of the important issues of social and cultural practice and only consider[s] tourism as a set of economic activities’. Löfgren (2002: 6) points out that people who study tourism too often ‘feel a need to legitimate their seemingly frivolous topic by pointing out its economic and social importance’. Only becoming the subject of anthropological / ethnographic enquiry in the mid-to late-1970s (Smith, 1977), tourism studies has never been seen as a discipline: defined as a ‘cornerstone of truth creation since its rules have been established and perfected over a long period with a view to understanding the reliability of research’ (Tribe, 2006: 366). While Graburn and Jafari (1991: 7) argue this has been largely positive for tourism, since ‘no single discipline alone can accommodate, treat or understand tourism’, tourism research has remained rooted in
positivistic and post-positivistic paradigms. Indeed, Jennings (2007) argues that representation of the use of qualitative methodologies in core tourism and business research textbooks still tends to be somewhat pejorative and/or dismissive.

Research and scholarship on drifting/backpacking travel in general has been relatively minor, its voluntary and temporary nature not seen as ‘real’ in the sense of not being recognised as reflexive or articulated through deep seated commitments, with no one discipline finding reason or benefit in studying them. While tourism researchers only saw the blurred landscapes that drifters produced (working, living, moving), anthropologists, sociologists and geographers saw (and still do) these travellers as middle class, free-floating individuals; whose ‘motive is not inquiry but self-protection and vanity’ (Fussell, 1982: 47). Their journey was seen as a step into non-conformism before settling down ‘to an orderly middle-class career’ (Cohen, 1972: 175) and ‘the responsibilities of children, careers, home ownership, and so forth’ (Riley, 1988: 318). That is not to say that a formidable body of literature has not emerged over the last decade concerning the global phenomena of backpacking – utilising particular disciplinary approaches to examine their motivation and economic and cultural impacts. Much of this work is centred around or associated with the work of Erik Cohen, backpacker research still largely dependent on a relatively small core of ‘theorists’ whose work has ‘tended to become petrified in standardized explanations, accepted analyses and foundational ideas’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 6).

For McKercher (1999: 425) this dependence requires researchers to look outside tourism for a relevant method, concept or theory since ‘much critical thought about tourism remains entrenched in an intellectual time warp that is up to 30 years old’. Like tourism research in general, research into backpacking remains polarised between research into host-guest relationships, tourist typologies, and traveller motivations and at the other end by a business and managerial focus. While the former is broadly anthropologic, focusing on individual backpacker aspirations using qualitative, ethnographic studies (Binder, 2004; Sorensen, 2003; Welk, 2004), the latter are market-based and seek to captures activity patterns, often placing economic value on particular practices (Doorne, 1993; Pearce, 1990). Wilson and Richards argue that the anthropologically-based approaches are primarily based around a limited range of dimensions such as ‘issues of alienation, rite de passage/moratorium, ritual, extension/reversal, the search for authenticity and distinction or cultural capital’ (Wilson and Richards, 2007: 10) but often lack a theoretical basis, where
literature reviews are limited to previous positivist-empiricist backpacker studies. It is often the case that researchers have been less mobile that the population they seek to research, often finding backpacking ‘goings-on’ as peculiar or approaching ‘the field’ as an objectively given world. Research by Haviv (2005) suggested backpackers are ‘often blindly follow[ing] the advice of Lonely Planet, choosing not to recognise how the guidebook leads them along a backpacking superhighway paved with cheap lodgings, English- or even Hebrew speaking natives, and restaurants serving banana pancakes’ (Haviv, 2005: 82, original emphasis). By treating the backpackers as an ethnographic object, researchers have increasingly introduced criteria into their studies, such as age and form related arrangements (accommodation use, length of time travelling) (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Min. Length</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Nationalities</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsrud (2001)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>18-71</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>N. European, USA</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>av. 23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy (2001)</td>
<td>No. min</td>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noy (2004)</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>S. America, Asia</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serensen (2003)</td>
<td>No. min</td>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreitzhofer (1998)</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>S.E Asia</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uriely et al (2002)</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>21-26</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van Egmond (2007)</td>
<td>No. min</td>
<td>20-32</td>
<td>Peru, Bolivia</td>
<td>W. European</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welk (2004)</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>Australia, Malaysia</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerhausen (2002)</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Western countries'</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maoz (2007)</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers (2007)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>19-75</td>
<td>N. Zealand</td>
<td>European</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:** Published material about backpacker tourism, based on ethnography or ethnographic methodology (adapted from van Egmond, 2007)

Loker (1991) indicated that backpackers needed to travel for at least four months, Westerhausen (2002) three months, Welk (2004) six months and Pearce and Foster (2007) four weeks or more. Elsrud (2004: 56-57) interviewed only those travelling for over one year or more, arguing it highlighted in her opinion ‘a total break with home routines and home times’. As well as requiring evidence they were travelling alone, Elsrud sought to interview backpackers who were using ‘budget’ transportation and accommodation and
travelling ‘off the beaten track’ but failed to recognise how backpackers are tied into networks of connections and obligations that stretch beyond this world\(^{66}\). Rather than see and listen to what is in front and around them, the ‘academic’ or ‘scholastic’ imagination has led researchers to concentrate on calculated emplacements at various sites of passage such as ‘backpacker hostels’ (Markward, 2008); the sample frame for most backpacker research (Thyne et al, 2005). Allowing themselves to pre-set limits and boundaries to the phenomena they are studying, there is little attempt to reconcile differences between these criteria even when in the ‘field’, their studies often missing the potential of the phenomena as they reduce the world to a small number of nodes and small sample sizes. There is an inbuilt assumption that researchers already know the ‘proper’ locations at which backpackers enter and invest themselves in ‘proper’ practices.

Grossberg (1992: 110) notes however, that researchers cannot ‘assume that the connections between such sites are always given in advance’, since people’s travel through daily life is unpredictable, since the world they enter always fluid and in a process of becoming. Backpacker research has largely led to typologies that reify backpackers as immutable, reducing them to vague generalisations and characteristics (Crick, 1989). Edensor (2000) argues ‘[t]heories of tourism have tended towards ethnocentrism, over-generalization, and functionalism’. Lofgren (2002: 267) notes that the ‘craze for classification’ within much tourism research often represents or produces ‘a tradition of flatfooted sociology and psychology,’ driven by ‘an unhappy marriage between marketing research and positivist ambitions of scientific labelling’.

Producing ever-finer subdivisions, it seems these more elaborate typologies ‘might eventually form a classificatory grid in which tourism [and backpacking] could be defined and regulated’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 7). Rather than behave in certain ways or conform to a particular repertoire of performances and comportments, I argue there is a need for deeper reflection about various mobility streams and cultures, since basic models and discussions of backpacking are often misleading, extrapolating from various practices a number of typologies (party backpacker, traditional backpacker). Rather than see backpacking reduced to a simple set of propositions (budget, extreme mobility), new theoretical approaches are emerging that Larsen (2008: 32) suggests are ‘de-purifying’ the disciplines concerned with travel and mobility, the multi-post disciplinary nature of ‘mobilities studies’ creating space for new discussion, approaches and methodologies that

\(^{66}\) Urry (2007) notes the economic, social, cultural, political, institutional and emotional, obligations and linkages that include event obligations, obligations to place, object obligations, legal obligations, economic obligations, familiar obligations and social obligations (Urry, 2003a).
can be applied to backpacking. As tourism studies move beyond the ‘objectivity’ of various (post)positivisms and typologies, Ateljevic et al, (2007) argue that we are witnessing a ‘critical turn in tourism studies’ with a marked reversal of thinking about tourism that had seen tourists ‘codified as objects of knowledge’ (Crang, 2006); new beliefs surrounding mobility requiring an ‘ontological shift in characterizing social action’ (Crang, 2006: 64).

4.3 New Mobilities Paradigm (NMP).

Meethan (2006: 3) argues a world on the move requires a conceptual reorientation able to ‘focus on how new forms of belonging and new forms of identity are emerging and cut across the old parameters of place, culture and society’. As the social sciences ‘reflect, capture, stimulate and interrogate’ movements across variable distances (Urry, 2006: 358), the world on the move is theoretically and methodologically challenging for tourism researchers. There has been a significant neglect of those motivated to cross borders by non-economic concerns, the lack of any common theoretical base within tourism research meaning that there is little agreement on how to explore ‘movement, nonmovement, and experience’ (Löfgren, 2002: 69) when all three go together. Traditionally, tourism was located within a ‘sociology of migration’ and a ‘sociology of leisure’ (Dann and Cohen, 1991), but as social scientists turn towards mobilities, it has led to new ways of seeing the world, becoming a framing device for researchers who are asking questions about how mobility is created, dealt with, negotiated and lived. Faced with massive flows of people, images, dangers, know-how and capital, researchers are seeking to explain how everything seems to be in perpetual movement throughout the world. While Appadurai (1993) speaks of ‘post-national’ orders, Cresswell (2006: 44) asks us to think not from ‘the study of bounded and rooted cultures’ but ‘to the study of routes – the way in which identities are produced and performed through mobility, more precisely travel’. Their premise is that the social is no longer bounded by ‘societies’ but ‘caught up in a complex array of twenty-first century mobilities’ (Cresswell, 2006: 1). This recognition of a deterritorialising and dematerialising world of connections, flow and movement finds researchers seeking to understand the world in new ways.

The new mobilities paradigm instructs researchers to move beyond narrow conceptions of human and material travel so as to consider a vast array of crisscrossing mobilities, shedding light on varied phenomena such as ‘the mobilities of money laundering, the drug trade, sewage and waste, infections, urban crime, asylum seeking, arms trading, people
smuggling, slave trading, and urban terrorism’ (Sheller and Urry, 2006: 220) as well as hoping to find out how ‘tourists’ fit into this moving world (Hannam, 2009). Questions as to how tourism works, how it performs, how it produces space as well as the intricacies of travelling and dwelling are increasingly asked through journals, research centres and conferences. It has also led to the realisation that since mobility clearly transcends previously inherited disciplinary boundaries, tourism must be seen as ‘just one form of a number of inter-linked mobilities, and as such tourism cannot be inspected in ‘splendid isolation’ without reference to other forms of movement’ (Coles and Hall, 2006: 290). It seems, tourism is now too important to be left to those who regard it as their domain whether it be geographers or those in sociology, given that scholars ‘exhibit a selective awareness of, and an apparent unwillingness to engage with studies of tourism beyond their disciplinary purview’ (Coles et al, 2006: 296).

As scholars invest in ‘crossing theoretical borders and to capitalize on progress made in other disciplines and fields of studies’ (Van der Duim, 2007b: 966), a ‘New Mobilities Paradigm’ (NMP) formed within the social sciences and has been proposed as way forward for tourism research, suggesting that we leave the ‘tourist’ behind to focus on flows of people, substances and information linked together in ‘relations of coupling, stickiness and fluidity, by which attachments and proximities are formed, and distancing or differentiation achieved’ (Sheller, 2003: 29). The mobilities paradigm at a broad level is simply a multi-post disciplinary approach to thought, inquiry and analysis, which challenges the sedentary nature of much social science research, demanding academics look again at objects of inquiries and the methodologies used for research. Researchers67 buying into this paradigm have sought to move beyond static idealisations of society ‘towards theories that are marked by terms such as nomadism, displacement, speed and movement’ (Adey, 2004: 501). Promoted by scholars such as Tim Cresswell, Kevin Hannam, Mimi Sheller and John Urry, the NMP has provided space for a multi-post disciplinary research agenda, since this ‘mobility turn’ (Cresswell, 2006; Hannam et al, 2006; Sheller and Urry, 2004, 2006) requires ‘a wholesale revision of the ways in which social phenomena are examined’ (Urry, 2008: 1).

This approach offers more flexibility and creativity for researchers in comparison to disciplinary parochialism, the NMP and its basic set of beliefs breaking away from

67 The NMP has taken a strong hold in academic units, research networks, and recognized publication outlets such as the ‘Mobilities Journal’ and research centres such as the Mobilities Research and Policy Center at Drexel University (USA).
disciplinary research that performs ‘a selector role determining what is included and excluded in both the framing of research and execution’ (Tribe, 2006: 366). Such disciplinary policing limits both perception and knowledge creation, the parochialism of disciplines tending to be ‘incapable of seeing beyond the questions posed by their own discipline, which provide an all-purpose filter for everything’ (Sayer, 1999: 2). Challenging ‘both the objects of its inquiries and the methodologies for research’ (Hannam et al, 2006: 5) the basic set of beliefs surrounding the NMP asks researchers to ‘consider circuits, not a single place’ (Clifford, 1997: 37) since travel consists of a ‘range of practices for situating the self in a space or spaces grown too large, a form both of exploration and discipline’ (Clifford, 1989: 177). Seeking to ‘reflect, capture, stimulate and interrogate those movements across variable distances that enable social relations to be performed, organized and mobilized’ (Urry, 2006: 358), tourism researchers have begun to highlight how tourism mobilities engender different experiences, performances and affordances.

I argue that the NMP can guide tourism practitioners without the necessity of long existential or epistemological consideration since it places tourism ‘within a larger cultural and economic context of the everyday life in which it is embedded’ (O’Dell, 2005: 14). It demands the researcher approach the subject through an epistemological and methodological approach that grasps not only what is exceptional but alternative ways of practicing mobilities (Jensen, 2009). As a way forward to ‘leave behind the tourist’, it proposes to establish a ‘movement-driven social science’ (Urry, 2007: 18), one that enables ‘social worlds’ to be theorized as an array of ‘economic, social, and political practices, infrastructures and ideologies that all involve, entail or curtail various kinds of movement of people, or ideas, or information or objects’ (Urry, 2007: 18). As researchers learn more about how tourism ‘works’ (Van Der Duim, 2007a,b), how it is performed and how it (re)produces space, they increasingly have to cross theoretical borders to capitalise on progress made in other disciplines and fields of study. While the NMP does not encompass the epistemological, ontological and methodological contours of a given research ‘school’ it is central to the researcher’s view of the world, one that seeks to avoid the positivistic, post-positivistic stances and western-centric paradigms and epistemologies that dominate tourism (Jennings, 2007). By demanding the researcher breaks down the complexity of the world in which backpackers find themselves, it influences ‘the very choice of questions deemed worthy of study, the methods used to study those questions, and the interpretations of the results’ (Rohmann, 1999: 296). It also influences the ontological assumptions that a researcher considers prior to the conduct of social research.
(Hollinshead, 2004; Zahra and Ryan, 2005) and represents a ‘new approach to excavate and access the meaning of human constructions of the world’ (Anderson, 2004: 254).

As outlined earlier, the aim of this dissertation arose as literature regarding backpacking was filtered through the NMP, demanding disciplinary boundaries be ignored ‘for a more all-embracing and relevant knowledge of the social world’ (Bauman and Tester, 2001: 7) and more appropriate research methods (Sheller and Urry, 2006), since ‘the analysis of mobilities as a wide-ranging category of connection, distance, and motion transforms social science and its research methods’ (Watts and Urry, 2008: 862). However, the dissertation still demands an ‘interpretive framework’, that encompasses ‘an epistemology of the relationship between researcher and its objects by framework of guiding assumptions, theories, and methods that define a particular approach’ (Cares et al, 2006). A research paradigm contains the researchers ‘epistemological, ontological, and methodological premises’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000: 19), with Hollinshead (2004a: 84) suggesting that ‘matters of ontology should always precede the choice of particular research method’ since it leads one to decide how a phenomenon should be understood and investigated (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).

4.4 Research Paradigms.

Before engaging with ontological and epistemological issues, it is importance to note what a paradigm is. Thomas Kuhn, brought the term ‘paradigm’ into common usage in his ‘Structure of Scientific Revolutions’ (1962) and can be defined ‘as the total pattern of ‘perceiving, conceptualizing, acting, validating, and valuing associated with a particular image of reality that prevails in a science or a branch of science’ (Cares et al, 2006). Reese’s (1980: 353) defines a paradigm as ‘a set of basic or metaphysical beliefs … sometimes constituted into a system of ideas that ‘either gives us some judgment about the nature of reality, or a reason why we must be content with knowing something less than the nature of reality, along with a method for taking hold of whatever can be known’. While new paradigms are brought to bear on cultures in transit, tourism researchers have been slow to craft more reflexive, interpretative and critical modes of research inquiry. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) claim borders and boundary lines separating paradigms and perspectives have begun to ‘blur’ and that various paradigms are beginning to ‘interbreed’. Yet, researchers are faced with diverse paradigmatic definitions and approaches to research.

68 A paradigm may be viewed as a set of basic beliefs (or metaphysics) that deals with ultimates or first principles. It represents a worldview that defines, for its holder, the nature of the ‘world’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1994: 107; original emphasis).
Creswell (2007), for example focuses on four worldviews (or paradigms): postpositivism, social constructivism, advocacy/participatory and pragmatism with Denzin and Lincoln (1994) examine positivism, post positivism, constructivism and critical theory but later added the participatory paradigm. Burrell and Morgan (1979) identified functionalist, interpretative, radical humanist and radical structuralist paradigms while Jennings (2001) discusses six paradigms: positivism, interpretative social sciences, critical theory, feminist perspectives, post modernism and chaos theory. Any discussion on paradigms also tend to involve discussions of ontology (the nature of reality and the nature of social reality) and epistemology (theories of knowing and theories surrounding the nature of the relationship between the knower and to-be-known) and methodology (or implied best procedures for coming to know). To facilitate the researcher, the following questions are used to inform decision-making:

1. The ontological question: What is the form and nature of reality and, therefore, what is there that can be known about it?
2. The epistemological question: What is the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known?
3. The methodological question: How can the inquirer (would-be knower) go about finding out whatever he or she believes is known?” (Guba and Lincoln, 1998).

Guba (1990) argues that responses to these questions are tantamount to a paradigm or the basic belief systems that will shape the inquiry and how it is to be practiced. My epistemological ontological position could be described as ‘constructivist’ (a research paradigm that is congruent with my beliefs about the nature of reality), but in a multi-paradigmatic approach, this text is also informed by the participatory paradigm and the interpretative paradigm, which shares the goal of understanding how human beings construct meanings as they interact and engage socially in the world around them, from the vantage point of those who inhabit the world.

*It is the view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context... In the constructionist view, as the word suggests, meaning is not discovered but constructed* (Crotty, 1998: 42)
The ontological basis of constructivism is that multiple realities exist which are interpreted, by individuals, in time and place. It is a research paradigm that denies the existence of an objective reality, ‘asserting instead that realities are social constructions of the mind, and that there exist as many such constructions as there are individuals (although clearly many constructions will be shared)’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1989: 43). Reality is, therefore, relative and is constructed from the mental constructions of individuals and reconstructed through communication and interpretation. While there is not a fixed reality out there, and one cannot simply measure it; one can interact with the realities that people construct. Therefore, the epistemology of constructivism is transactional and subjectivist, where all ways of understanding are historically and culturally relative, meanings ‘constructed by human beings as they engage with the world they are interpreting’ (Crotty, 1998: 43). Underpinned by a relativist ontological worldview, it is a worldview where we construct our interpretations not in isolation ‘but against a backdrop of shared understandings, practices, language, and so forth’ (Schwandt, 2000: 197).

Multiple, intangible mental constructions socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature (although elements are often shared among many individuals and even across cultures), and dependent on their content on the individual persons or groups holding the constructions. (Guba and Lincoln, 1998: 206).

By adopting the (social) constructivist paradigm, knowledge and truth are seen as the result of perspective, created, not discovered by the mind, where individuals develop habitual behavior and institutions based on beliefs (Berger and Luckman, 1966: 70-3), socialised into an acceptance of ‘this is how things are done’. Berger and Luckman (1966: 17-18) see social constructionism as an extension of the Marxist proposition that human consciousness is determined by social being, a theoretical framework that distinguishes between how ordinary members of society acquire knowledge about how the social world is kept together and how learned scholars acquire knowledge about the social world. The constructivist paradigm sees the form and nature of reality (ontology) as being relativist. That is:

Constructions are not more or less ‘true’, in any absolute sense, but simply more or less informed and/or sophisticated. Constructions are alterable, as are their associated ‘realities’. (Guba and Lincoln, 1998: 206).

However, for the purposes of this text, constructivism is also seen as a theory of learning and social constructivism as a development and subset of constructivist learning theory. Learning to be a backpacker (or tourist) is highly compatible with social constructivism,
which emphasises the manner in which learners actively (but often slowly) construct their knowledge and understanding on the basis of social interaction in learning contexts, rather than passively receiving knowledge in a pre-packaged form. Social constructivism emphasises the importance of social context (garnered by the learner from his or her particular culture, social interaction with more knowledgeable members) since ‘constructionists are interested in delineating the processes that operate in the socio-cultural conduct of action to produce the discourses within which people construe themselves’ (Lock and Strong, 2010: 7). Pritchard and Woollard (2010: 7) note social constructivists tell us that ‘reality is constructed through shared human social activity’ since it is members of a community that create the properties of the world which they share and which they understand in an agreed way. They argue social constructivists believe knowledge to be a human creation and that it is constructed by social and cultural means, since ‘[m]eaning and understanding are created by individuals by means of their social interactions and their interaction with their environment’ (ibid, 7). Finally, they argue social constructivists tell us that learning is a social process (neither simply an individual process, nor a passive process). Inherent in this paradigm is the concept of phenomenology, since the aim of text is to make sense of peoples’ actions from an ‘insider’s perspective’ and particularly how a ‘life-world’ is constructed; the nature of ‘action’ in the ‘life-world’; and the relationships between the separate subjectivities that interact with each other to make up social groups of vital importance (Lock and Strong, 2010). Such an understanding also incorporates a need to understand the body, since backpackers spend most of their time ‘doing things’, which involve bodily actions (Casey, 2000).

Denzin and Lincoln’s (2000) participatory paradigm points to how participants’ views and values can inform the views and values of the researcher when participating in the phenomenon they are studying. It raises the question as to whether the researcher remains an actor or adopts the values of the participants. Central to the participatory paradigm is that the researcher’s theory-laden values are not privileged over the participants’ views and values (Hall, 1996). I adopt the paradigm as far as that I am seeking to participate directly in the life of backpackers. Epistemologically the relationship between the knower and the known for the participatory paradigm is critically subjective and transactional (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000), but rather than the researcher and the participants co-producing findings, this text is rooted in the interpretive paradigm. Creswell (2007: 21) argues social constructivism is often combined with interpretivism, noting how ‘[t]he goal of this research then is to rely as much as possible on the participants’ views of the situation. Often these
subjective meanings are negotiated socially and historically…. The researchers intent, then, is to make sense (or interpret) the meanings others have about the world’. It is a paradigm that suggests researchers should explore ‘socially meaningful action through the direct detailed observation of people in natural settings in order to arrive at understandings and interpretations of how people create and maintain their social worlds’ (Neuman, 1997: 68).

In comparison to the positivist paradigm and the deductive approach of starting with theory and testing the theory in the empirical world (Jennings, 2001), the ontological basis for interpretists is not an objective reality ‘out there’ but multiple subjective mental constructions since the paradigm ‘seeks to explain the stability of behavior from the individual’s viewpoint’ (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). The starting point of this research is a reality of phenomena: backpackers and backpacking, which exists independent of the researcher’s investigation. Any social constructions of the researcher can only be elicited and refined through interaction between the researcher and respondents, observing an ‘ongoing processes’ from within to better understand individual behavior and the ‘spiritual nature of the world’ (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). However, any one of a range of multiple realities is not more or less ‘true’ in an absolute sense but simply more or less informed and/or sophisticated (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). These realities and their construction can change over time since relativism can lead to conflicting social realities not only between researcher and informant but also for the individual researcher if his/her constructs change as he/she gets more informed and experienced over time. However, the researcher should avoid imposing viewpoints, but instead become one of the participants so as to understand the subjective experience of those being researched (even if it entails researching a range of views and perspectives). Morgan (1980: 608-609) argues that the interpretive paradigm:

*is based upon the view that the social world has a very precarious ontological status, and that what passes as social reality does not exist in any concrete sense, but is the product of the subjective and inter-subjective experience of individuals. Society is understood from the standpoint of the participant in action rather than the observer. The interpretive social theorist attempts to understand the process through which shared multiple realities arise, are sustained, and are changed.*

Therefore, during the research process, I assumed a relativist69 ontological position (multiple realities exist as personal and social constructions), a subjectivist epistemology (the researcher is involved) and the adoption of naturalist methodological procedures, since

69 Relativists claim that concepts such as rationality, truth, reality, right, good, or norms must be understood ‘as relative to a specific conceptual scheme, theoretical framework, paradigm, form of life, society, or culture . . . there is a non-reducible plurality of such conceptual schemes’ (Bernstein, 1983: 8).
The investigator and the object of investigation are assumed to be interactively linked so that the ‘findings’ are literally created as the investigation proceeds (Guba and Lincoln, 1998: 207). The distinction between ontology and epistemology disappears as ‘what can be known is inextricably intertwined with the interaction between a particular investigator and a particular object or group’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1998: 206), researchers in their ‘humaness’, part of the research endeavor rather than objective observers, therefore retaining the integrity of the phenomena being investigated. These ontological and epistemological positions form the basis for the selection of an appropriate research methodology and methods for this particular study, demanding a processes by which the researchers (inquirer or would-be knower) goes about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known (methodology). This paradigm suggests a range of methods to gather and analyse data about the meanings people attach to their movement and practices, but suggests that individual constructions can be elicited and refined only through interaction between researcher and respondents, so as to ‘distil a consensus construction that is more informed and sophisticated than any of the predecessor constructions’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1998: 207).

According to Schwandt (1998: 225) the researcher has to ‘focus on the processes by which these meanings are created, negotiated, sustained, and modified within a specific context of human action’, suggested a qualitative approach is more appropriate as ‘it is usually seen as richer, more vital, as having greater depth and as more likely to present a true picture of a way of life, of people’s experiences, attitudes and beliefs’ (Haralambos and Holborn, 2000: 971). Any methods should be naturalistic, drawing upon multiple methods, interpretive as well as emergent and evolving (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998), requiring observation and participation in backpacker movements, meanings and practices. It requires that the researcher participate in various patterns of movement and the practice and performances of backpacking, engaging with people’s worldview by travelling with them, seeking closeness to the participants in their world.

4.5 Research Strategy.

Clifford (1994) argues the sedentarist theories present in many tourism studies restrict a vision of tourism as a series of discrete localised events, where destinations are seen as bounded localities and the fundamental basis for experiences. I have argued that we must move beyond destinations when studying backpacking, and consider their imagined (world)
as a distinct social field. Researchers have encountered difficulties in capturing this population since backpackers are located worldwide, never gathering in one place or staying in one location for very long, neither a community or bounded social group or occupying a stable space. As backpackers are extremely mobile (moving from place to place, sensation to sensation), it is impossible to adhere to conventional ‘ethnographic’ like fieldwork of prolonged interaction and / or observation within a stable group. The researcher must ‘go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known about?’ (Heron and Reason, 1997: 276). Crang (2002) argues that we require more nuanced and critical interpretations rather than mining narrative, interview ‘data’ which lack validity and reliability while Shurmer-Smith and Hannam (1994: 224) demand a ‘more radical transgression, that of understanding and fusing into all of the illogics and anti-logics that inform our engagement with the world and the people within it’.

Being inherently socio-spatial, backpacking suggests mobile rather than static methods, demanding the researcher moves along with the people in embodied participation so as to gain knowledge of the practices central to the production of experiences and encounters and therefore subjectivity (Frohlick and Harrison, 2008). These ‘mobile methods’70 involve ‘participation in patterns of movement’ (Sheller and Urry, 2006: 217) rather than mimicking the mobile subjects being studied and emphasises movement away from ‘objective’ observation. Such methods are predicated on research in context, the immediate relationship between the participant and that emotional and social space in which subjects are mobile the important ingredient, given the vital relationship between spatial identity, human action, knowledge formation and subjectivities. Various multi-sited methods such as the macro-ethnography of translocal sites, multi-site ethnographies and nomadic ethnographies (Appadurai, 1996; D’ Andrea, 2007; Marcus, 1995, 1998) have sought to capture mobile cultures. Axup and Viller (2005, 2006) tested contextual interviews, site surveys, participatory activities, field trips, team ethnography, contextual questionnaires and electronic diary methods with backpackers. They found that there is no method that fits every situation, with different methods containing different structural strengths and weaknesses, working better or worse in certain social settings and fitting some research questions better than others. Moreover, the failure of researchers to engage or participate in this world (cf. Axup, 2006) was also a drawback. There is a need to consider backpacking in a more holistic way, displacing the ‘geocentric (Ptolemaic) paradigm of

70 Watts and Urry consider that ‘the analysis of mobilities as a wide-ranging category of connection, distance, and motion transforms social science and its research methods’ (2008: 862).
mainstream anthropology in favor of a relativist (Einsteinian) perception of spatiality’ (D’Andrea, 2007: 114), involving travelling with people, ‘participating in their continual shift through time, place and relations with others’ (Watts and Urry, 2008: 867). While traditionally, the research ‘field’ was characterised as a predominantly bounded, physical entity, specified by topography and identifiable by cartography (Nast, 1994) containing a whole culture with relatively immobile research subjects, the ephemeral nature of backpackers’ interactions and movement requires physically going ‘out there’. It is a ‘messy business’ (Rose, 1997: 314) as the ‘field’ is not some a series of fixed and bounded backpacker enclaves or hostels, but something real and imagined, over here and over there, something lived, unpredictable and always in a process of becoming.

My ontological and epistemological position views backpacker practices, meaning and movement not simply as a matter of dominant discourses or a powerful tourist gaze prescribing what may be experienced but as a performance making process of their own, one that stresses the on-going mass-building of worldviews by individuals in dialectical interaction with society. The numerous realities so formed comprise, according to this view, the imagined worlds of human social existence and activity, gradually crystallised by habit into institutions propped up by performative conventions, given ongoing legitimacy by western discourses and ideologies of mobility, maintained by socialisation, and subjectively internalised to become part of identity. De Certeau (1988: xi) points out that everyday practice should not be concealed ‘as merely the obscure background of social activity’, and asks researchers to ‘penetrate this obscurity’ and to ‘articulate everyday life’ so to establish a fundamental reconsideration of the concept. Merleau-Ponty (1962: 102) argues that ‘[b]y considering the body in movement, we can see better how it inhabits space (and, moreover, time) because movement is not limited to submitting passively to space and time, it actively assumes them, it takes them up in their basic significance which is obscured in the commonplaceness of established situations’, a multi-paradigmatic study requiring the use of actions, interactions, bodies, beliefs, values, impressions and thoughts of backpackers a way to gather understanding.

By looking, listening and being practically and bodily involved in their life world and seeking an active lived relationship with it, I sought continual contact to become part of this research, rather than rely on retrospective accounts through interviewing backpacking when they returned home (Noy, 2007; Maoz, 2007b). To understand backpacking is to become an involved participant in their world, immersion a means to understand lived
experiences, their way of being-in-the-world and understanding how they articulate their embodied involvement. Placing an emphasis on ‘understanding the worlds from the perspective of its participants … should view the social life as being the result of interaction and interpretations’ (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004: 4), I sought to investigate both the minute and material particulars of practices, movements, meanings and relations by tracing points of connection and lines of flow through immersive involvement and participation, negotiating and collaborating with others within the spatial, symbolic and discursive boundaries that mark their social, spatial and temporal world. My basic ontological assumptions demand a method or series of methods that could address this social reality and the practices, which are bodily, expressive and inter-subjective. Adler and Adler (1987: 26) argue that researchers who seek to gain a valid sense of the social field, its contextual meanings need to participate to the fullest degree, arguing that researchers ‘who are not complete members can never be fully cognizant of the members’ world’. They argue that outsiders can attain no more than a mere ‘approximation’ of members’ meanings and their understandings of everyday life events and instead need to develop a ‘commonsense knowledge’ of how participants in a social world achieve the ‘perceived normality’ of their ordinary social environments (Garfinkel, 1967: 94). Rather than demanding continuous social interaction or observation of a given set of informants (Sørensen, 2003), this approach demands impromptu interaction with the many while throwing off selective criteria, the emphasis instead ‘placed upon studying things in their natural setting, interpreting phenomena in terms of meanings people bring to them, humanizing problems and gaining an ‘emic’ or insider’s perspective’ (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004: 4). Utilising, multiple methods, my entry into the field was informed by ethnomethodology (EM), an approach that helped to unlock the life-world performed into being by backpackers, my subjective liminal interactions, encounters, conversations and embodied mobilities a way to access the world of backpacking, ensuring the inquirer and inquired into were fused into a single entity, where data and findings are the process of interaction between the two.

Using ethnomethodology (EM), a naturalistic methodology (informed by the interpretive tradition) that typically eschew’s quantitative approaches is traditionally carried out in institutional and local settings, such as workplaces, classrooms, medical clinics and courtrooms where workers and lay people deploy practical reasoning (Maynard and Clayman, 1991), but increasingly applied in more casual arenas of social life where lived experiences are made intelligible (Dourish, 2004a), I found an approach that requires full commitment to its members and their social world. EM is grounded in a ‘great familiarity
with and, ideally, a bona fide competent in the discipline under inquiry’ (Dowling, 2007: 829), so as to grasp ‘the native’s point of view’ (Malinowski, 1922). EM provides an approach where the researchers’ values are not privileged over the participants, since it is humans that create the worlds they study. EM can also be termed a paradigm, since it is an approach where data collection is reflexive, flexible, informal and context-dependent, incorporating the mundane and the extraordinary, an approach carried out through practice that tries to give a new perspective on describing the emergence of order out of the shared experience of members of particular social worlds or societies.

It is an approach that suspends the use of social science ‘methods’ as a means of consultation, instead allowing the world I enter to envelop me71, so as to interpret the stream of experiences, images, stories, people, myths, people’s objects that flow within it. While I have always felt this world through guidebooks, movies, books, memories, pictures and souvenirs from previous travels, friends stories and the media, I sought to experience three periods of embodied participation. Each trip was followed by a period of reflection, blogging and writing, enabling me to focus on certain practices, data, interviews, stories and interactions in the subsequent trips, the repeated exploration and evaluation implicitly multi-post disciplinarity. Flying to Rio de Janeiro on the 12th of October 2006, I travelled72 north on what the Israeli backpackers call the northern route or ‘gal haoleh73, travelling through Salvador, Natal, Belem and Manaus (Brazil), Iquitos, Lima, Cuzco (Peru), La Paz (Bolivia), Asunción (Paraguay), Salta, Buenos Aires (Argentina) and Santiago (Chile). I returned to the United Kingdom on the 10th of January 2007. On the 12th of September 2007, I left the United Kingdom, visiting Hong Kong, Macau, Yangshuo, Dali, Guilin (China), Bangkok (Thailand), Ho Chi Minh City and Hanoi (Vietnam), returning on the 10th of October 2007. This followed a well-travelled backpacker route (Hampton and Hamzah, 2010). Finally, en route to a conference, I visited Jaipur, Delhi, Manali and Shimla in India from the 6th of March to the 6th of April 2008. During my research trip to South America, I used the Lonely Planet Guidebook ‘South America on a Shoestring’ guidebook (Palmerlee et al, 2004) and while in India, I used the India Handbook by Footprint (Bradnock and Bradnock, 2001).

71 Like the proponents of new journalism such as Norman Mailer (1923-2007), Hunter S. Thompson (1937-2005), and Tom Wolfe, EM requires an intensive and time consuming commitment to the topic at hand.
72 A Royal Geographic Society Travel Bursary funded the flight to South America. I had previously visited South America in 2003, spending six months on the southbound route ‘gal hayored’, visiting southern Chile, Argentina and Brazil. I have been to South East Asia numerous times since 1997. It was my first visit to India, and incorporated a paper presentation at the third Backpacker Research Group (BRG) symposium organised by ATLAS and Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla between 26th - 28th March 2006.
73 These elaborately mobile communities are held together by a network of established routes, a circuit of pathways and passages that enable consumption of a range of amenity-rich landscapes, while also insulating the traveller from the perils of solitary travel: the loneliness of the lonely planet.” (Allon, 2004: 50).
However, as one interacts with this world and the people within it, one learns where the action is, whether its in particular restaurants, guesthouses, hostels, bars, buses or trains, a form of participation that finds its own opportunities and constraints. Such research must encompass backpacker movement in places and through places, from hostels to backpacker enclaves. By following well-known backpacker routes, the different dimensions of backpacker movement became apparent - which Cresswell identifies as purpose, velocity, rhythm, route, and spatial scale (Cresswell, 2010), this world soon enveloping me. My research strategy also encompassed the socially and culturally constructed systems of meaning that surround backpacker mobilities and signifying practices within backpacking since mobilities are an experiential phenomenon that must be practiced and performed into being. Choices on countries, routes, sites and participants combined set routines and improvisation but the strategy was largely based on staying in the field over a long period (seven months in total), time in analysis and interpretation equal to time in the field where the researcher becomes a research instrument to employ multiple qualitative techniques, building, developing and solidifying rapport with backpackers to uncover insight into their movement and practices. Building build trust, rapport and 'authentic' communication patterns (Janesick, 2000: 384) with backpackers on networks of mobility, rather than remaining on one site for any period of time, I follow Marcus (1995) and Falzon (2009) who suggest utilised a multi-site approach so as to cope with 'mobile and multiply situated' objects of study (Marcus, 1995: 102).

4.6 Ethnomethodology (EM).

Jamal and Hollinshead (2001: 67) propose qualitative research in tourism that ‘rests on a departure from static, quantitatively measurable knowledge towards a focus on understanding and expressing that aspect of being which is dynamic, experienced and elusive of the positivist researcher’. Seeking a ‘genuine cross-disciplinary coverage of the tacit, the subjective, the discursive or the interpretive’ (Hollinshead, 2004a: 65), a ethnomethodological (EM) approach helps to focus on the practices of real people in real settings and on the methods by which individuals maintain a shared sense of social order. Originating in the work of Harold Garfinkel in the 1950’s and influenced by symbolic interactionism and phenomenology, Garfinkel brought his ideas together in the book ‘Studies in Ethnomethodology’ (Garfinkel, 1967). Ethnomethodology literally means the

While I advocate ‘following’, rather than suggesting a ‘given’ space or set of trajectories (networks of mobility), the field is produced and transformed by people, goods, information, and so on, my route continually been remade.
study (ology) of people’s (ethno) methods of knowing about and creating social order (method), or the ‘the study of ethnomethods’ / ‘members’ methods (Dowling, 2007; Johnson, 2008) where social order is organised from within the social situation by members participating as ‘a stream of experience’ (Boden, 1994: 46).

Based on the writings of Alfred Schutz, Talcott Parsons, and Edmund Husser, EM does not have a theory in a conventional sociological sense (McCabe, 2002) and is described by Garfinkel (1967: 11) as referring to ‘various policies, methods, results, risks, and lunacies with which to locate and accomplish the study of the rational properties of practical action as contingent ongoing accomplishments or organised artful practices of everyday life’. Heritage (1984: 8) notes its subject matter is ‘the body of common sense knowledge and the range of procedures and considerations by means of which the ordinary members of societies make sense of, find their way about in, and act on the circumstances in which they find themselves’. Fitting into the philosophical background of social constructivism, EM provides the means to concentrate on practices, methods, procedures and performances, so as to uncover the commonsense methods by which people achieve the orderliness of action (Dourish, 2004a) and raises the question of how people who are interacting with each other can create the illusion of a shared social order even when they do not know all others in this world.

Ethnomethodologists argue, that in order to organise action, people make decisions based on what they consider is ‘unquestionably true’ (Bloor and Wood, 2006: 76) and are concerned with the taken-for-granted assumptions that come to pervade everyday lives. EM asks how social life is achieved, established and maintained for all practical purposes, ‘proceeding from a viewpoint of the processes through which the supposed stable features of organized everyday life are continually being created and recreated’ (McCabe, 2002: 70). Concerned with how ‘participants create, assemble, produce and reproduce the social structure to which they orient’ (Heritage, 1987: 231), EM is an approach that appreciates a participant in any social world as ‘knowledgeable’ and reflexive, with actors producing and recognising the circumstances in which they are embedded (Maynard and Clayman, 1991). The point of using EM as a approach rather than a study or method is ‘to discover the things that persons in particular situations do, the methods they use, to create the patterned orderliness of social life’ (Garfinkel, 2002: 6), its freedom to use multiple methods (participation, observation, interviews and other ethnographic techniques) both practical and useful when investigating backpacking. Garfinkel was concerned with the ways
individuals internalise and then act out a social world’s norms and values, making sense of that world and each other and how individuals call on conventions and norms to make their behavior and practices accountable.

Used in the world of policing (Hester and Eglin, 1992), nursing (Dowling, 2007) and tourism (McCabe, 2002, 2007) it argues social worlds are constituted through the situated reasoning of knowledgeable actors as they accomplish their practical purposes, creating and maintaining a sense of order and intelligibility (Have, 2004). EM requires a ‘being-in-the-world’ that is at once practical, reflexive and embodied, mentally and bodily going ‘where the action is’ (Goffman, 1969b), so as to observe, participate and respond to the performances ‘in the wild’. It demands the researcher engage the phenomenon under consideration not just practically but also imaginatively in a way in which performance is felt in a relationship with others and with objects, spaces, and things. ‘Doing’ backpacking is not only a matter of researchers being in the space or representing the space or even practicing space (Pons, 2003) but also performing it (Crouch, 2004); which encompasses ‘being’ as much as ‘doing’. My personal competence as a backpacker enabled me to approach backpacking not as a ‘thing’ or ‘object’ but as an ongoing accomplishment of human practice and interpretive work, where participation (or membership) of a social world is understood as sustaining it. Backpacking can come alive for researchers through its ‘doing’ and ‘being’, the EM approach allowing me to enter this world, albeit in the framework of a west-centric discourse (white, English speaking, heterosexual, able bodied male).

Have (2004) notes the various ways one can access and study lived orders, including the strategy of intensive interaction with members, putting themselves into the everyday lives of those under study, investigating the ordinary members sense making practices that create the social, practices that make ‘circumstances look as if they aren’t created at all, but are simply there for everybody to see’ (Brandt, 1992: 319). As the researcher uses his or her own membership knowledge, he or she must leave room for chance, serendipity and improvisation (Hannerz, 2006), their ‘unique adequacy’ (Garfinkel, 1967) describing how a researcher needs to be a competent practitioner of whatever social phenomena they are studying. Sharrock (2003: 252) notes how the researcher ‘must identify from within the scene and amidst its constituent flows of activity whatever forms of orderliness are

75 Ethnomethodologists use the term ‘member’ to embody a person who has ‘embodied the ethnomethods of a particular group’ and who ‘naturally’ exhibits the social competences that affiliates that person with an ethnoscape or group, allowing that person to be recognized and accepted.
indigenously integral to and practically identifiable in those affairs, together with whatever practices are used to effect such orderliness’. The EM approach, Hutchinson et al. (2008: 100-101) argue enables the researcher to make genuinely adequate designations of competent actors and social actions; using reflection and explication rather than ‘empirically research’ to study the ‘missing what’ (the work that people actually do) and what is involved in operating as a fully-fledged participant. Focusing on what the backpacker does as an active individual requires the researcher to take into account individual actions, conversations, interactions, settings and physical events; using their experience and knowledge to ‘say on one’s own behalf what someone is doing because one can satisfy socially required conditions for making such decisions’ (Hutchinson et al. 2008: 100). By understanding what the individual is doing is also to understand a great deal about the social setting and the environment in which practices are performed, the researchers’ position within the embodied, lived and situated practices of everyday life as insiders or regulars (rather than strangers or tourists)\(^7\) meaning they learn where the action is. Whether it is in particular restaurants, guesthouses, hostels, bars, buses or, trains, rather than ‘an operation conducted by an observer using independent criteria independent of the occurrences being identified’ (Hutchinson et al., 2008: 99), it is in the form of participation that the researcher can interpret the phenomena while on the move in terms of the what people do, the members concerted work making ‘social facts observable and accountable’ (Maynard and Clayman, 1991).

I use EM as an approach rather than a study, where knowledge and material accumulated through EM (observation, participation and analysis) is accumulated. Connected to the strategies of inquiry, it must also be connected to methods for collecting material (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000), Garfinkel and Wieder (1992: 255) noting that the researcher must have ‘a concerted competence of methods with which to recognise, identify, follow, display, and describe phenomena of order in local productions of coherent detail’. EM doesn’t see backpackers as cultural dupes, but as competent actors, reflexive, rationale and knowledgeable, capable of learning and using systems of knowledge in daily practices. The EM approach recognises signifying practices are used by backpackers to perform their accomplishments within their world, members reflexively using them for achievement and distinction, understanding them to be rationale, ‘internal meanings’ externalised and made

\(^7\) Every social world contains four types of members: strangers, tourists, regulars and insiders (Unruh 1979, 1980). Tourists are temporary participants coming on the scene momentarily seeking the exotic essence of the world before moving on to another world while strangers are people who approach ‘an already-established social world with an attitude of objectivity and detached indifference’ (Unruh, 1979: 116).
available to researchers through observation.

4.6.1 Participant Observation.

EM does not use a mandatory set of data collection methods (Dowling, 2007; Johnson, 2008) and therefore, researchers are compelled to borrow methods from ethnography that are grounded in naturalist methods such as observation and immersion. Frances and Hester (2004: 23) note that methods should focus on ordinary observational competencies to capture the bodily enacted ‘here and now’ quality of practices. Participant observation is useful once researchers suspend the ‘educated’ ways in which they have been taught to make sense of the social (Sacks, 1992) so as to situate oneself strategically and unobtrusively within the social world. Rather than participate and observe in a detached ‘experience far’ way (Adler and Adler, 1987), such an approach must be ‘experience near’ (Geertz, 1973) since the social processes gained from being an insider differs from remaining a tourist in this world. Participant observation allows the researcher to be with others, and at the same time, allows for observation of how the subjects orientate, adapt and interpret for themselves and others while in the social field. Only by taking part intellectually, socially and spatially as a backpacker can the researcher truly get access to the lives of those being studied, observing how this world affects them and how they affect the world, decentring the individual backpacker from analysis prompting us to think about how different configurations of objects, places, ideas, and bodies come together to form the experiences of `being with' whilst on the move (Bissell, 2007, 2009). Participant-observation in this respect demands that the observer becomes immersed in the full range of backpacker socio-spatial practices, not so much as a sociological technique as much as it is an inevitable and necessary part of competent participation (Francis and Hester, 2004). Field-research in general is where the ‘researcher and researched directly interact in relationships that tend to be periodic, short and intense; (Nast, 1994: 54) but Bittner (1973: 121) argues that traditional field research may only lead to distance between the members and the researcher and suggests that many researchers lack any commitment to the members’ settings, arguing ‘the reality bonded by an ethnographic work project is that it is not the field worker’s own, actual life situation’, Adler and Adler (1987: 28) noting that researchers ‘are inhibited by the fact that they are trained and taught to study others, rather than themselves’.

Bittner (1973: 121) argues that this may be because the researcher distains accepting the
members’ world as his or her own, or because of failed attempts to make his or her world a place of ‘dwelling’ but because ‘he cedes it as not being his world,’ deliberately undertaking a view that it is the world of others as ‘specimens. Adler and Adler (1997: 27) argue that the only way researchers can avoid constituting the social world differently from the way members do ‘is to abandon their social scientific allegiances’ and cast off the methodological and theoretical concerns of social science by suspending talking about life in terms of agency, control groups, hypotheses, independent variables, criteria, sample sizes and structures. Polsky (1967) calls for a ‘postponement of theory’ to allow the researcher pay attention to and make sense of what is happening and observe people’s movement, of bodies undergoing various performances of travel, from face-to-face encounters, relationships with places, events and people (Urry, 2007: 39-43). Using participant observation, talk, encounters and interaction but incorporating a reflective (thinking) aspect, the researcher is ‘more or less’ a participant and ‘more or less’ an observer, my position on the continuum determining the reaction to events, activities, practices and encounters (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).

It is a highly flexible mode of inquiry which makes ‘no firm assumptions about what is important’ but ‘encourages researchers to immerse themselves in the day-to-day activities of the people whom they are attempting to understand’ (May, 1997: 133), May’s more exacting ‘complete participant’ mode (cf. Gold, 1969) is best suited to illustrate my position. During my time in the field, I created time to write field-notes but primarily to record ‘analytic memos’ on a digital recorder, role segregation facilitated by audience segregation (Goffman, 1961) so as to avoid being overt. The analytic account ‘raises questions that were posed in the course of conducting the research, hunches that the researcher may hold, ideas for organising the data’ (Burgess, 1981: 76). These memos were supplemented by photographs, which ‘may were used as a means of summarising situations in which the researcher has been involved and to reveal in graphic form the pattern of social interaction and spatial relationships’ (Burgess, 1981: 77).

I sought and maintained ‘enduring contact’ with this world throughout my PhD programme with the aid of online identity work, the imagined world to which backpackers belong increasingly extended into virtual, imaginative realms as backpackers produce travel blogs, forum posts, twits and images from their journeys; the gap between real and imaginary, virtual and physical and between absence and presence becoming increasingly blurred. As backpackers participate in this world, practices are incorporating technological innovations,
using the Internet and mobile phones to broadcast their participation, sustaining a narrative about how they would like to be seen, suggesting self-fashioning and ‘world-making’ as they come forward as ‘auctors’ (authors/actors) who ‘create and shape things as much as … [we] might be a product of that creation and shaping’ (Bauman, 2008: 52).

I remained in this world through participation in online forums such as Boots’n’all, the Lonely Planet Thorn Tree and membership of various hospitality exchanges (O'Regan, 2009) underlying how old meanings of concepts such as territory, place, home, mobility, and community are changing. My membership of a site called couchsurfing.com for example enabled backpackers and others to visit me and stay with me and in my home since I joined in 2005. I argue the field exists anywhere the field is felt, my membership of Couchsurfing (CS) enabling me to intermittently share the same discursive realm as backpackers, online and offline, meaning the ‘backpacker’ and their world was never excluded from everyday concerns, their world overlapping with mine, leading to shared intra-action rather than conflict. Fifteen semi-structured interviews with members of the CS network formed the basis of a book chapter in 2009 (cf. O'Regan, 2009) and were incorporated into the bricolage. In addition, soon after I started my PhD at the University of Brighton, I starting blogging about backpacking on my academic website (www.nomadx.org) posting 3,000 entries about backpacking. I also incorporated 270 blog entries from my online travel diary from my previous travels (irish-guy.com) into my data analysis, since it remained a repository where I detailed my backpacking trip from February 2003 to March 2004.

4.6.2 Semi-Structured Interviews.

In addition to participant observation, I also sought and obtained interviews with backpackers during my research. However, given my complete participation, I was self-conscious about revealing my true self and once I threw off my backpacker position and renegotiated my relationship with subjects through the role of interviewer and academic, I found that the repositioning proved demanding for participants. While my position as a backpacker was assured, given the similarity in accumulated (sub)cultural capital and my search to build on that capital through participation, my repositioning as a researcher / academic / interviewer diminished this capital. Given the lack of exchange value between the (sub)cultural capital and economic institutionalised/cultural capital, it meant that I was no longer immersed within this world, my questions also breaching the imagined world
(community) of those subjects that I chose to interview. As my professional credentials were presented, subjects clammed up, becoming defensive, using the opportunity for self-construction and selecting which truths to convey (Meyrowitz, 1985). In addition, because practices are about the ‘ways things are or the way ‘we do things’ are not spelt out or written down, more experienced and knowledgeable travellers found verbal explanations ‘superfluous’, except if such explanations are directed at ‘newcomers’ (Johnson, 2008). As interviews try to alternate the researcher’s perspective with the perspective of the investigated, their accounts when ‘interviewed’ were often ambiguous and even misleading with significant differences between what I observed and what they said they did during interviews. They often downplayed violations of the ‘backpacking code of behavior’ (Uriely et al, 2002: 534) or any practices deemed inappropriate to the ideal form and type characteristics of backpacking.

Defensive justification helps to defend the legitimacy of the social order; my new role considered a form of ‘symbolic violence’ (Bourdieu, 1977) which rapidly used up ‘interview rapport’ (Garfinkel, 1967: 113). By seeking to elicit information from members, I learned that backpackers are working constantly to achieve a meaningful, patterned, and orderly character of everyday life, their ‘structural stories’ (Freudental-Pedersen, 2009) functioning as a sort of rationality used to defend practices and movement to themselves and me. When I developed a second approach and downplayed my research, the interviewees assumed that the research project was secondary to the trip, an opinion that led to playful and ironic comments as to the merit of my research. Lozanski and Beres (2007) found backpackers saw their research project as a ‘scam’, which undermined their status as competent researchers, Goffman (1961) describing a ‘discrepant role’; that brings a person into a social establishment under a false guise. When viewed in terms of self and role, I repositioned myself as an ‘outsider’, identified in terms of role, not in terms of self. In both cases, respondents utilised me as an object to shape their identity and performance by either being playful or hostile to academic scrutiny (Davidson, 1999, 2005; Edensor, 1998; Lozanski and Beres, 2007) so as to appear in a better light. Edward Said (1984: 51) argues:

*With very little to possess, you hold on to what you have with aggressive defensiveness. What you achieve in exile is precisely what you have no wish to share, and it is in the drawing of lines around you and your compatriots that the least attractive aspects of being an exile emerge: an exaggerated sense of group solidarity as well as a passionate hostility
toward outsiders, even those who may in fact be in the same predicament as you’.

Bourdieu (1988: 2-5) argues that no group loves an ‘informer’ especially perhaps ‘when the transgressor or traitor can claim to share in their own highest values’. This includes both fieldworkers and sociologists, who ethnomethodologists argue reflexively influence those they study given there is no politically innocent methodology (Clifford, 1992). My attempts to break a particular performance only acknowledged this world and its inhabitants’ existence, and re-affirmed the ethnomethodological literature that observes that people do have reasons to act the way they do. Dourish (2004a: 75) argues individuals ‘continually operate according to explicable mechanisms by which they regulate or organise their action and understand the action of others’. I found interviews failed to expand knowledge about a phenomena beyond the interviewees’ viewpoint, with Thrift (1994: 296-297) noting how we cannot extract a representation of the world if those interviewed are ‘slap bang in the middle of it, reconstructing it with numerous human and non-human others’. As they consciously and beyond consciously colonise what it means to inhabit time-space in a certain way, the socialisation process for many is ‘unconscious … ineffable, embodied rather than discursive’ (Archer, 2007: 43). Graburn (2002: 20) argues that tourists ‘may be unable to state their true feelings, or their feelings may be so labile or confusing that any answer could be misleading or multivalent’ while Jenkins (2003: 53) notes such responses might simply describe ‘the state of affairs which ought to happen because the nature of the occasion inspires them to explain (or justify) their behaviour, in addition to (or instead of) describing it’. I did not formally ‘request’ additional interviews after November 15th 2006 (first trip), but instead sought to develop informal discussions with backpackers, coming to agree with those ethnomethodologists who argue that members of a social world do not make their practices primary topics of discussion and are generally ‘uncomfortable when anyone who forces them into the limelight’ (Hilbert, 2004: 254). Twelve interviews were recorded, transcribed and incorporated into this bricolage strategy, but such interviews did not see participants willing to share everything. The interviews took place in backpacker hostels in Brazil (5), Bolivia (4), Peru (2) and Argentina (1). Rather that accept such an approach compromises the research strategy, I argue it provided more data, my immersion starting the inductive process, allowing time for ‘thinking, becoming aware of

---

77 Ken Gergen (1994: 53) argues ‘[t]he [social constructionist] is little likely to ask about the truth, validity, or objectivity of a given account, what predictions follow from a theory, how well a statement reflects the true intentions or emotions of a speaker, or how an utterance is made possible by cognitive processing. Rather, for the [social constructionist], samples of language are integers within patterns of relationship. They are not maps or mirrors of other domains — referential worlds or interior impulses — but outgrowths of specific modes of life, rituals of exchange, relations of control and domination, and so on. The chief questions to be asked of generalised truth claims are thus, how do they function, in which rituals are they essential, what activities are facilitated and what impeded, who is harmed and who gains by such claims?’
nuance and meaning in the setting, and capturing intuitive insights, to achieve understanding’ (Janesick, 2000: 391). Field notes of interactions with backpackers continued to be digitally recorded and written, the move way from forced interviews no reflection on the ability to establish trust and rapport, since methods must reflect the field of study. The journal was used throughout the study in order to reflect on and document my beliefs, feelings, observations, emotions, interactions and thoughts, as well as the movements, stories and practices of others. Designed to capture lived experiences, like the data as a whole, it entailed the situational combination of field techniques (note taking, audio-/visual recording, observation) and participant observation, data produced in and of ‘thick’ interaction between researcher/s and researched (Falzon, 2009).

4.7 The Qualitative Bricoleur.

Methodologically, I sought through my research strategy to observe and participate in backpacker movements and practices as well as obtain meanings through individual reconstructions, interpret them with representations of that movement and to coalesce them into a consensus (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). While my qualitative (multi-method) approach had accumulated fresh field data, I was concerned that any attempt to assemble and present it through selective quoting or story telling would lead only to a partial account of backpacking and would not generate a coherent picture of their world and the various voices arising from it or answer my research aim. Indeed, I believed it would strip this imagined world (community) of its broader cultural relevance, the context of its production and its inhabitants. It would also largely discount many of actions, interactions, impressions, experience, beliefs and practices (the embodied and experienced aspects of moving) that participant’s use to achieve consensus. While the researcher self was central in the collection of data, any partial report would minimise new knowledge, and and the useful data gained through EM, participant observation and interviews (which had pointed to a world full of complexity, with varing types of networking, cultural practices, interactions, meanings, movements, insitutions, symbols, communicative domains) and would not produce the most informed and sophisticated construction I knew was possible. I wanted to advance through my academic journey, and while I could have partially met my aims by stopping at a partial account of backpacking, I had already found that ethnographic researchers who engage empirically with the phenomenon of backpacking often negate or relegate conceptual debates and do not address fundamental theoretical concerns. I found myself searching during my field work for a more holistic approach to understanding this
world, Denzin and Lincoln’s (2005: 4) description of the term ‘bricoleur’ aptly describing my developing researcher position. I became increasingly sensitive to members’ methods in an attempt to capture the complexity of their world; a bricolage coming to exist out of respect for the complexity of the lived world and an understanding ‘that there is far more to the world than what we can see’ (Kincheloe, 2005: 346). The bricoleur seeks to undertake an inductive approach to their research by getting more involved with the data in order to develop explanations for the phenomena.

Kincheloe (2005: 323) suggests a bricolage as an alternative to explorations that mimic those of the scientific paradigm, one in which ‘bricoleurs move beyond the blinds of particular disciplines and peer through a conceptual window to a new world of research and knowledge production’. Lincoln and Guba (2000) argue it is possible for researchers to combine or blend elements from one paradigm into another, providing the opportunity ‘for interweaving of viewpoints, for the incorporation of multiple perspectives, and for borrowing or bricolage, where borrowing seems useful, richness enhancing, or theoretically heuristic’ (Lincoln and Guba (2000: 167). They urge researchers to recognise that boundaries between the paradigms as shifting and fluid, where blending perspectives depend on the axiomatic elements being similar. By combining (social) constructivist, participatory and interpretive paradigms and multiple methods, I was able to extend the knowledge of backpacking beyond situated accounts of movement, practice and meaning to understand and explain lived experience, insider understandings and their positions in the world.

While I had a ‘vulgar competence’ (Garfinkel and Wieder, 1992) in relation to the phenomenon or practice under scrutiny, I wanted to use this knowledge in new ways, since EM tends to marginalise blurred boundary areas and historical realities (Clifford, 1997). My immersion within their world, by ‘taking a look at activities, hanging around with practitioners, training up in the activity’ (Hutchinson et al, 2008: 99-100) provided an insight into a leaning environment, from which new entrants were socialised, where practical action and the logic of the field was taken seriously, creating an apparently stable world as
constituted through situated, interpretative and reflexive reasoning by knowledgeable actors as they accomplished their practical purposes. Using a bricolage strategy, a critical researcher or bricoleur can employ multiple strategies to represent the meaning and knowledge produced in the research project, producing a bricolage based on the use of many different interpretive practices and methodological tools. The researcher seeks out and pieces together sets of observed and encountered practices and performances to make a solution to a puzzle (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998), their ‘artisan-like inventiveness’ (de Certeau, 1988) piecing together all which the subjects demonstrate, verbally and through ‘practice performance’, until the researcher can reveal a complete ‘quilt’.

As a critical, interpretive, theoretical bricoleur78, a point was reached after periods of research, reflection and writing when the researcher needs to present as complete a picture as possible. Richardson (1980) notes how after participation and observation, the researcher steps back, a critical distance emerging only during points of reflection as the researcher ‘returns home to make sense’ of the research (Grossberg, 1989: 23), where ‘back in the recesses of his mind, he asks in a whisper, almost as if he were afraid: What does it all mean?’ (Richardson, 1980: 221). While Have (2004: 37-38) argues those who involve themselves in EM ‘do not need any special warrants for their claim to understand their materials’, he argues for a second phase which ‘necessitates that they take a distance vis-à-vis the differentiated interests and disputes of commonsense life’. This interpretative paradigm means the researcher becomes a teller by interpreting; the ontological basis being that there is no objective reality, but multiple subjective mental constructions. Traced from Weber’s Verstehen (understanding) tradition in sociology to the Cartesian philosophy of Rene Descartes (1596-1650), his ‘ego sum cogito’ or ‘I think, therefore I am’, the interpretative paradigm rejects the view that humans can be studied in the manner of the natural sciences and instead investigates the world of the human experience by getting inside and understanding from within (Zahra and Ryan, 2005). Rather than value-free, detached observation, the ‘interpretivist approach, to the contrary, looks for culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world’ (Crotty, 1999: 67; original emphasis). I argue that an important component of the interpretivist approach by
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78 While the critical bricoleur knows that the boundaries that previously separated traditional disciplines no longer hold, the theoretical bricoleur reads widely and is knowledgeable about the many interpretive paradigms that can be brought to any particular problem. Moreover, ‘the bricolage understands that the frontiers of knowledge work rest in the liminal zones where disciplines collide’ (Kincheloe, 2001: 689).
the bricoleur is constructing something new from a range of functioning materials (Lévi-Strauss, 1966: 17-22). This approach frames the research, as well as all field notes, blogs, observations, interviews, photographs, historical texts, academic literature as well as intensive introspection (Hollinshead, 1996; Jamal and Hollinshead, 2001), the task being to weave together sets of participated in and observed practices and performances and unpacking them to uncover meaning.

Hollinshead (1996: 69) observes that Denzin and Lincoln’s bricolage provides tourism research with ‘a ventilated approach to social and human enquiry that seeks to combine the intellectual stimuli of postmodernity with the necessary practicalities involved in knowing local/grounded/population specific situations’. The bricoleur must have broad knowledge so as to recognise and reflect the complexities and realities of lived experience(s) of not only the participants, but also the researcher’s role as co-constructor, incorporating everything into a new work. The bricoleur is a ‘quilt maker’, ‘Jack (or Jill) of all trades’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005) stitching the accounts of movement, meaning and practices together in a pragmatic and self-reflective way so as to contextualise and conceptualise different aspects of the world. Hollinshead (1999: 276) argues the researcher draws as much ‘upon his/her own personal experience for his/her ‘research’ methods, and accordingly works outwards towards the discovery of new truths in novel scenarios from the analysis of events recalled from his/her own biography’, a work like this dissertation borne out of ‘endless incidental observations’, utilising them to the needs of the research project. The aim for any researcher is ‘to implement a critical interpretative approach that will help them (and others) make sense of the...conditions that define daily life in the first decade of this new century’ (Denzin and Lincoln 2005: xiv). As such, my role requires me to confront this world through the lens of a scholar’s interpretive perspective, presenting to the reader their perceptions and constructions of another's world while testing his own understandings and perceptions. The bricoleur produces a bricolage – that is, ‘a pieced together set of representations that are fitted to the specifics of a complex situation” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000: 4) and while never providing absolute truth, it leads to a reflexive collage or montage that is internally coherent and externally recognisable to reviewers, showcasing what I believe to be true.

For Denzin and Lincoln (2005), a bricolage is like a quilt that connects the parts to the whole, bringing together different voices, world views, value systems, and beliefs so that they can have a conversation with each other; while resisting conclusions. Drawing on C.
Levi-Strauss (1966), Denzin and Lincoln (2005) describe how a researcher can piece together bits and pieces of previous literature, observation, participation, practices and conversations to produce a bricolage, a ‘complex, dense, reflective, collage like creation that represents the researcher's images, understandings, and interpretations of the world or phenomenon under analysis’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994: 3).

Since my bricolage is not merely interpretive, but also critical and theoretical, my bricolage sought not only to develop a richer inventory of experience but also to reconsider underlying theory and knowledge and the wish to ‘ask informed questions, develop complex concepts, construct alternate modes of reasoning, and produce unprecedented interpretations of ... data’ (Kincheloe, 2005: 339) since they realise that the ‘bricolage exists out of respect for the complexity of the lived world’ (Kincheloe, 2004a: 131). They ‘see alternatives, limitations, different ways of making sense, and pragmatic solutions that are not degraded by their pragmatism. They borrow, experiment, and share’ (Kincheloe, 2005: 326). Bogdan and Biklen (2007: 4) note that ‘[l]earning to do qualitative research means unlearning this social construction of ‘research’, and opening oneself to the possibility of employing a different vocabulary and ways of structuring the research process’, a means of contributing to ‘the development of a geographical theoretical approach to mobility .. in part of an ongoing process of mesotheoretical construction’ (Cresswell, 2010: 17). I looked to general theories of tourism, various models and heuristic tools that best captured my research data and make sense of the world I had observed and participated in, but found myself moving further and further from tourism studies and across disciplines as diverse as human geography, history, sociology and transport studies. I sought a conceptual framework (theoretical framework) to present a preferred approach to make sense of the world I encountered, a framework that could connect to all aspects of inquiry (e.g., problem definition, purpose, literature review, methodology, data collection and analysis).

Conceptual frameworks can act like maps that give coherence to empirical inquiry, and bricoleurs must make decisions about which domains to engage as they pursue new insights and exploit the conceptual power provided by the interaction of different perspectives. Over the course of twelve months, I sought to apply various frameworks, to make sense of the complexity of their world. From anthropological theories of globalisation, the study of global media, migration and tourism (Appadurai, 1990), actor-network theory (Latour, 2005), Giddens ‘ability theory of practice’ (Giddens, 1984), Worldmaking (Goodson, 1978), de Certeau’s (1988) ‘theory of everyday practices, the theory of cosmopolitanisation (Beck, 2000), Garfinkel’s (1992) theory of practice to assemblage
theory (Deleuze, 1992), I sought to apply various frameworks that could address my field data and write about a reality through a window of theory, explaining how mobilities produce and re-produce norms, meanings and a travelling culture, a conceptual framework that could contribute to a understanding of the ontological character of backpacking. While a positivist or post-postivist approach would leave much unanswered, unsaid and untheorised, after reading an ‘Outline of a Theory of Practice’ (1977) by Bourdieu, a conversation with Bourdieu began, as I assigned various pieces of original data to Bourdieu’s concepts (habitus, field, capital).

Connecting data to Bourdieu helped introduce a new way of looking at backpacking, but while providing clarity and contributing to our standing of backpacking (explaining, predicting, originality), using Bourdieu was never an easy step. I had to think very critically about using his theory of practice. Unlike Bourdieu’s ‘objectivism’, I don’t set out to ‘set out to establish objective regularities (structures, laws, systems of relationships, etc.) independent of individual consciousness and will’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 72). Since Pierre Bourdieu sought to understand the fabric of French bourgeois culture after the Second World War, his theorisation of the constitution and maintenance of social and cultural groups concentrated on the sovereign station state and a bounded and relatively homogeneous group. However, even Bourdieu (1991: 106) argues that ‘social science must include in its theory of the social world a theory of the theory effect which, by helping to impose a more or less authorised way of seeing the social world, helps to construct the reality of that world’, although he proposes systems of mental structures, systems of classification and principles of hierarchy. However, I came to concur with the argument that ‘one of the most distinctive features of Bourdieu’s work ... has always been his insistence on joining theoretical and empirical work in an indissoluble approach to analysis’ (Postone et al., 1993: 11), an argument I support in this bricolage. I came to see this imagined world (community) of backpacking as a field, requiring an examination of how this ‘theory effect’ is a stake in the struggles that define the field. It was a realisation that does not allow me to revert to a partial account or accept a mere taxonomy. Even though I knew Bourdieu’s vision to be inadequate, I sought to extend it, his theory of practice used as a heuristic tool.
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79 Pierre Bourdieu published (he passed away in January 2002) over 40 books and some 400 articles during his lifetime (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005). I have to sought to read most of his english language output, a a labour (of love) which took a considerable amount of time. Of course, there have also been many thousands of articles and books written about and with his concepts.

80 Given my ontological and epistemological assumption, human subjects cannot be studied through the methods of the physical sciences, such as cause and effect laws, ‘the complex and problematic nature of human behaviour and experience’ (Burrell and Morgan (1979) capture the spirit of the work of the anti-positivists who argue human beings should not be subject to deterministic laws in the physical sense since they are ‘free’ beings.

81 ‘This world, indeed, is the one most often taken as real; for reality in a world, like realism in a picture, is largely a matter of habit; (Goodman, 1978: 20)
a conceptual framework that enabled me to work in and across fields, drawing from the diverse practices, conversations, perspectives and field data, his concepts, I argue, an effective explanation of the mechanisms whereby backpacking reproduces (maintaining coherence and stability through time-space), extracting new insights into a social, cultural, economic, and spatial phenomenon.

_Bricolage does not simply tolerate difference but cultivates it as a spark to researcher creativity ... Sensitive to complexity, bricoleurs use multiple methods to uncover new insights, expand and modify old principles, and reexamine accepted interpretations in unanticipated contexts._ (Kincheloe, 2001: 687).

My bricolage is of course open-ended, always situated and partial and should be seen as ‘rough and ready’ rather than any definitive or authoritative account of backpacking. I found that bricolage offered me the means to pursue multiple paths at once, and allowed my to approach past literature relating to backpacking in new ways. Each past account of backpacker practice, movement, meaning and various representaions was more fully examined, adjusted and repositioned within my bricolage. However, as Bunzei (1967: xiv) notes, ‘[t]here is no magic formula, but there are many paths to partial truths’, and however wise we are, we never learn the whole truth’. The bricolage drew power from my own field data as well as self-reflection, my daily habit of blogging and introspection and does not draw insights from the literature surrounding backpacking itself. However, as a bricoleur, I draw upon this literature to turn out thicker and more complex research to produce concepts and insights about the social world that previously did not exist. There is no fear of such literature contaminating, constraining, inhibiting, stifling, or impeding the bricoalge, since I engage proactively with the literature to interweave it within the process of this emergent study, adding another voice to the researcher’s construction. From regional, national governmental reports, journal articles to edited books, the literature provides a context within which the this world emerged, since their raw physical movement, practices and represenations are inscribed by history, culture, power and meaning, backpacking invested with a profound array of meanings in literature and film.

My approach allowed for a phase of illumination (for expanding awareness) and explication that includes description and explanation to capture the the complexity of this world. By seeing differently, new connections between previously unconnected literature across
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82 Of course, within EM, there is the issued of dubious interpretations and misinterpretations, since EM sometimes transcends the common sense world.
disciplines emerges, uncovering what has been dismissed, deleted, and covered up, making a variety of previously repressed features of the social world visible, bricoleurs engaging in what might be termed the fictive element of research. As much as the multi-methods made visible the social and spatial practices, meanings and movement, Bourdieu’s conceptual tools enabled me to best utilise my field data. In practical terms, the writing up process draws on numerous textual and critical strategies to ‘interpret, criticize, and deconstruct’ (Kellner, 1995: 98) the cultural artifacts under observation. Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 3) call for bricoleurs to cross disciplinary boundaries to employ ‘hermeneutics, structuralism, semiotics, phenomenology, cultural studies, and feminism’ as well as various interpretive perspectives in their analysis. As the researcher incorporates a range of views and perspectives, he gains the ability ‘to see beyond the literalness of the observed’ and moves ‘to a deeper level of data analysis as he or she sees ‘what’s not there’ in physical presence, what is not discernible by the ethnographic eye’ (Kincheloe, 2001: 686). Like Okley (1994: 21):

After the fieldwork the material found in notebooks, in transcripts and even contemporary written sources, is only a guide and trigger. The anthropologist writer draws on the totality of the experience, parts of which may not, cannot be cerebrally written down at the time. It is recorded in memory, body and all the senses. Ideas and themes have worked through the whole being throughout the experience of fieldwork. They have gestated in dreams and the subconscious in both sleep and waking hours, away from the field, at the anthropologist’s desk, in libraries and in dialogues with people on return visits.

A reflective informed bricolage helps researchers move into a new more complex domain of knowledge production in the writing up process, gaining a new ability to account for and incorporate various dynamics into his or her research narratives where they become ‘far more conscious of multiple layers of intersections between the knower and the known, perception and the lived world, and discourse and representation’ (Kincheloe, 2001: 686). Providing a new angle of analysis, ‘a multidimensional perspective on a cultural phenomenon’ (ibid) it should display the researchers ‘philosophical / epistemological / ontological sensitivity to the context of the analysis’ (Kincheloe, 2001: 688). Given the time constraints in a doctoral programme and the length of a doctoral dissertation, a student can only construct the most useful bricolage that his or her knowledge provides, and cannot guarantee generality since the bricolage is never completed and is always in a process of becoming. Critics have noted the thick, complex and dense output from this approach and question whether such an approach meets authenticity criteria, since few procedures can ‘test’ the validity of the research. A bricolage largely rests upon the researchers self-auditing personal experiences and the observed and participated in movement and
practices, which the researcher sees as relevant to the project at hand. Hollinshead (1999: 276) notes such inscriptive writing, which seeks to purposefully discover new truths will not find favour with ‘quantifrenics or with dry/hard science methodolatrists (methodolatry), who sanctify their own favoured orthodoxies of ‘properly disciplined’ inquiry, namely, those preferred forms of investigation that are predicated on the seeming purity of an esteemed vision of internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity’.

Hollinshead argues in social science, ‘there are only ever interpretations, whether the given researcher be ‘bible-bashing’ positivist or ‘heretical’/’upstart’ bricoleur’ (ibid). However, I practice ‘bricolage’ very seriously and push towards new conceptual terrain for the sake of research rigour, I agree there is ongoing suspicion of approaches such as mine (as well the status of data gathered by approaches such ethnomethodology), my work ‘vulnerable to dismissal and to trivialization as commonplace’ (Richardson, 1993: 705). There is the issue as to whether the bricolage over theorises and over-conceptualises issues at the expense of a solid, empirically based assessment of how backpacking works and issues relating to theoretical coherence. Kincheloe himself argues (2001: 681) that ‘the research bricoleurs pick up the pieces of what’s left and paste them together as best they can. I make no attempt to attach notions pertaining to reliability and (internal and external) validity, canons of positivist research that claim a ‘consistency and replicability over time, over instruments and over groups of respondents’ (Cohen et al, 2007: 146). The researcher’s fidelity to procedure cannot simply be ‘checked off and certified’ (Kincheloe, 2001), my immersion in the everyday lives of backpackers not free of value commitments. Lather (1993) notes the ‘obsession’ with validity and approaches validity not as ‘epistemological guarantees’ but as ‘partial, endlessly deferred [validities that] construct a site of development for a validity of transgression that runs counter to the standard validity of correspondence: a non-referential validity interested in how discourse does its work, where transgression is defined as the game of limits... at the border of disciplines, and across the line of taboo’ (Lather, 1993: 675).

While a bricoalge cannot be completed or fully accomplished in the time span of a doctoral program, ‘the process can be named and the dimensions of a lifetime scholarly pursuit can be in part delineated’ (Kincheloe, 2004b: 51). As one labors to expose the a world full of complexity, using different multiple methods to create my own bricoalge of theory and method, my role becomes vital. It is my interaction with this world and its inhabitants, my reflection about the data, my different ways of knowing the data, my immersion in the
emerging data and my practice of writing that aids conceptual / theoretical sensitivity. It is I alone that choose to enter their world with as few predetermined thoughts as possible, enabling me to ‘remain sensitive to the data by being able to record events and detect happenings without first having them filtered through and squared with pre-existing hypotheses and biases’ (Glaser, 1978: 3). It is through this journey that allowed me to seek and find a fresh ways of seeing this world without diminishing the lived practices of this world and without ‘forcing’ the data. While one should not underestimate its difficult development between fieldwork, teaching, blogging, introspection and reflection, requiring what Zalis (2003) calls a ‘theatre of recollections’ in order to hold it all together, a first step in ‘a lifetime of scholarly pursuit’ (Kincheloe, 2001), ‘[t]heorising is the act of constructing . . . from data an explanatory scheme that systematically integrates various concepts through statements of relationship’, where theories themselves are ‘interpretations made from given perspectives as adopted or researched by researchers’ (Strauss and Corbin, 1998: 25).

Given I had no preconceived ideas to prove or disprove, the multi-method approach, constant data comparison, writing and reflection as I extended Bourdieu was not forced, but progressed slowly, late encompassing literature to look for convergent evidence from different sources. Rather than having a ‘fertile obsession’ (Lather, 1993) with validity or alternatives such as data / investigator / theory / methodological triangulation (Janesick, 2000), I agree with Denzin and Lincoln (1998: 4) that ‘the combination of multiple methods, empirical perspectives and observers in a single study is best understood, then, as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, and depth to any investigation’. I adopt the concept of crystallisation as verification of one’s research. Proposed by Richardson in the early 1990s and based on a postmodern perspective, she considered the traditional notion of ‘validity’ as a rigid, fixed, two-dimensional object (Janesick, 2000; Richardson, 1994). Using a crystal as a metaphorical description, Richardson (1994) demonstrated how the notion of ‘validity’ could be addressed in qualitative research. While research based on the postpositivism paradigm traditionally relied on triangulation, Richardson argued such an approach is based on the assumptions that there is a fixed point of reference, where the point of intersection that can be triangulated. The concept of crystallisation assumes that there can be no single, or triangulated, truth, and instead there are many sides or perspectives from which to approach the world. Richardson (2000: 2000: 934) defines crystallisation as:

"[c]ombines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances,"
transmutations, multidimensionalities, and angles of approach. Crystals grow, change, alter, but are not amorphous. Crystals are prisms that reflect externalities and refract within themselves, creating different colours, patterns, and arrays, casting off in different directions. What we see depends upon our angle of repose. ... Crystallization, without losing structure, deconstructs the traditional idea of “validity” (we feel how there is no single truth, we see how texts validate themselves), and crystallization provides us with a deepened, complex, thoroughly partial, understanding of the topic. Paradoxically, we know more and doubt what we know. Ingeniously, we know there is always more to know.

The concept of crystallisation recognises the importance of the researcher in incorporating other disciplines and worldviews and the many different facets and angles of any given approach. Relection, writing and multiple interpretive methods led to richer data and more in-depth data analysis, enabling me to consider the data from many (although not all) perspectives. Supported by Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 873), crystallisation recognises that any given approach to study the social world as a fact of life has many facets, and like the crystal, it grows, changes and alters, but is not amorphous and provides the reader with a complex, deep, but completely partial understanding of the topic (Richardson, 2000: 934-935). Upon reflecting on the research process, crystallization seems to embody the many intricacies inherent in this study, and while I (partially) capture its complexity, I must be aware of the many other different facets I did not explore.

Taking the crystal metaphor on board, I argue my multi-paradigmatic and bricoleur methodology offers a multi-faceted and multidimensional understanding of backpacking, a methodology that addresses the complexity of this world. The distance during the writing up period enabled me to incorporate the use of other disciplines, ‘crystallization’ offering an ever-changing image of multiple realities that can be constructed, recognising the ‘many facets of any given approach to the social world’ (Janesick, 2000: 392). Focusing my attention in four directions: inward and outward, backward and forward, ‘crystallization’ means that what we see depends entirely on how we view it. Given my approach to analysing the collected data, I argue this text has multidimensionalities, angles and multiple facets, given. I have developed particular facets during a particular conceptual approach to the social world, the research developing and clarifying important common themes that emerge from the data (Janesick, 2000). Over the next five chapters, using Bourdieu’s theory of practice as a heuristic tool, very different facets of this world will surface. Based on intersections of areas such as focused reading and emerging results, the bricolage enables me to argue for the emergence of travellerscapes (Chapter 5), the relationship of those scapes with systems of mobility and spaces of consumption (Chapter 6), the emergence of a backpacker habitus and (sub)cultural capital (Chapter 7); and the
the influence of political / judicial / economic context and individual agency (Chapter 8). These aspects of a lived world can be compared to different sides of a crystal, helping us to get a sense of the crystal as a whole. While the NMP remains a guiding meta-theory, these facets are aspects of an emergent construction, but collectively, I believe I have interpreted the data to provide quite a composite picture, partially illuminating key aspects of the crystal, but recognising only a partial understanding of the phenomenon can be obtained. Richardson (2000: 937) argues that the following criteria can evaluate social scientific publications.

1. **Substantive contribution:** Does this piece contribute to our understanding of social life?
2. **Aesthetic merit:** Does the use of creative analytic practices open up the text and invite interpretive responses? Is the text artistically satisfying and complex?
3. **Reflexivity:** Are the authors cognizant of epistemology? How did they come to write this text? Do the authors hold themselves accountable to the standards of knowing and telling of the people they have studied?
4. **Impact:** Does this affect me emotionally and intellectually? Does it generate new questions? Does it move me to use new research practices?
5. **Expression of reality:** Does this text provide an embodied sense of lived experience?

I suggest my test should be evaluated on this basis and suggest it makes a substantive contribution to our understanding of backpacking, enhancing our understanding of backpacker’s lives, providing an embodied sense of their lived experience and answering my research aims.

**4.7.1 Study limitations and delimitations.**

Creating a Bricolage allows the researcher to cross borders and disciplines, avoiding reductionistic knowledge to pursue complexity rather than order and certainty. The journey to this partial and situated bricolage wasn’t easy as I struggled to find and develop numerous strategies and conceptual frameworks so as to get beyond one-dimensionality. The strength of this bricolage is enabling the bricoleur to become a knowledge producer, who never carries on a simple dialogue with the world, but instead interacts ‘with a particular relationship between nature definable in terms of his particular period and civilization and the material means at his disposal’ (Strauss, 1966: 19). Rather than seeking
the ‘truth’ of their social world or the truth about their reality, this bricolage offers multiple perspective out of respect for a complex world, avoiding the monological knowledge that emerges from unquestioned frames of reference and the ‘dismissal of the numerous relationships and connections the link various forms of knowledge together’ (Kincheloe, 2003: 250). The strength of this bricolage is the acceptance that backpackers belong to a world that is ever changing, the reality that bricoleurs engage in never a fixed entity. Another delimitation is that, a bricoalge enables the researcher to ‘revisit the past’ (Lincoln and Denzin, 1994), enabling me to look back. Those who see limitations in this approach, argue often note Hammersley (1999), who suggests that the bricolage metaphor may be dangerous and interferer to science in its capacity to understand and deal with the world, the movement in the direction of ‘blurred genres’ and the construction of reflexive ‘bricolages’ threatening the ‘implicit contract that underlies the public funding of social science’ (Hammersley, 1999: 581). While Kincheloe (2003) feels that unilateral perspectives on the world fail to account for the complex relationship between material reality and human perception, Hammersley (1999) argues views the bricoalge to ‘the creation of myth’ (ibid, 576). He argues that multiple perspectives may not make a coherent whole, the mixing of methodologies a sign of methodological impurity and thus superficial, a jack-of-all-trades, master of none’. However, I argue my multi-paradigmic and bricoleur approach does produce new knowledge, if not value-relevant knowledge. Other limitations that routinely emerge surround the academic journey and whether, even a doctoral student can devote sufficient time to understanding the disciplinary fields and knowledge bases from which particular modes of research emanate. While Kincheloe feels that becoming a bricoleur is a lifelong process, critics argue that in seeking to know so much the bricoleur may only know parts well. However, Kincheloe (2004b: 50) argues that in light of the paradigmatic upheavals with the social, cultural and epistemological changes of the past forty years, ‘rigorous researchers may no longer enjoy the luxury of choosing whether to embrace the bricolage’.

Others argue one’s perspective can necessarily mediatse all interpretation and it’s thus inevitably laden with presuppositions, values, biases and limitations, with Kellner (1995) noting that a reading of a text is only a reading from a critic’s specific position, no matter
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83 Kellner (1995) that multiperspectival approaches to research should also be situated historically, an appreciation that leads to a grasp of new relationships and connections, Kincheloe (2001: 682) noting that any object of inquiry is inseparable ‘from its context, the language used to describe it, its historical situatedness in a larger ongoing process, and the socially and culturally constructed interpretations of its meaning(s) as an entity in the world’. Cresswell (2010: 29) argue figurations such as the hobo still ‘moves through the patterns, representations, and practices of mobility in the present day’ (Cresswell, 2010), and argues we cannot understand new mobilities without understanding old mobilities.
how multiperspectival, arguing that it ‘is only their own reading and may or may not be the reading preferred by audiences’ (Kellner, 1995: 99-100). However, bricoleurs seek to avoid one-sidedness and partial vision by learning ‘how to employ a variety of perspectives and interpretations in the service of knowledge’ (Nietzsche, 1969: 119). Rather than see it as a limitation, I argue my research makes it acceptable to look at any possible means of knowledge-generation and discovery that could be relevant to the task of finding out more about the research topic. Depending on one’s perspective, my bricolage may either be more satisfying and informative to read, or more difficult to read, since its written in a non-standard format without a literature review or rigid methodology. I believe adds richness to the reader’s experience because the writing then attempts to respect the situatedness and lived complexity of backpackers. It is acknowledged by bricoleurs that a great deal of responsibility is on their shoulders, but as I argue above, I am confident that this text speaks for itself, and would be happy to let any researcher or indeed backpackers judge its readability and superficiality. While this bricoalge enables me to diverge from named methods, tough to skim for ‘findings’ and ‘bullet points’ of knowledge, I argue I have successfully communicated my bricolage in writing.

4.7.2 Researcher Position.

Researcher reflexivity has come to be recognized as important since knowledge production is not a disinterested process, the partial and situated nature of knowledge production combining ‘true fictions’ or ‘partial truths’ (Clifford and Marcus, 1986) casting doubt on the idea that ‘competent observers’ can ‘objectively report their own observations of the social world’ (Feighery, 2006: 239) since researchers often uncover ways of accessing a concept without resorting to a conventional validated set of pre-specified procedures that provide the distance of objectivity. My position and dispositions feed into the research process, and while less important when the ‘subject position’ and ‘social historical context’ has a relatively high level of habitualisation and institutionalisation, such positions and worlds are never fully ‘fixed nor static’ (Norquay, 1990: 291). While my aim was to subjugate as much

84 ‘But precisely because we seek knowledge, let us not be ungrateful to such resolute reversals of accustomed perspectives and valuations with which the spirit has, with apparent mischievousness and futility, raged against itself for so long, to see differently in this way for once, to want to see differently, is no small discipline and preparation for its future ‘objectivity’ -- the latter understood not as ‘contemplation without interest’ (which is a nonsensical absurdity), but as the ability to control one’s Pro and Con and to dispose of them, so that one knows how to employ a variety of perspectives and affective interpretations in the service of knowledge. Henceforth, my dear philosophers, let us be on guard against the dangerous old conceptual fiction that posited a ‘pure, will-less, painless, timeless knowing subject’; let us guard against the snares of such contradictory concepts as ‘pure reason,’ absolute spirituality,’ ‘knowledge in itself’: these always demand that we should think of an eye that is completely unthinkable, an eye turned in no particular direction, in which the active and interpreting forces, through which alone seeing becomes seeing something, are supposed to be lacking; these always demand of the eye an absurdity and a nonsense. There is only a perspective seeing, only a perspective ‘knowing’; and the more affects we allow to speak about one thing, the more eyes, different eyes, we can use to observe one thing, the more complete will our ‘concept’ of this thing, our ‘objectivity,’ be. But to eliminate the will altogether, to suspend each and every affect, supposing we were capable of this -- what would that mean but to castrate the intellect?’ (Nietzsche 1969).
as possible all roles and possible selves except that of backpacker, rather than become wholly and unconsciously detached from a scholastic habitus, it meant not being overly infected with a scholastic point of view, a ‘engaged detachment’ that enabled me to keep distance with multiples ‘selves’ and roles, roles which I would need to rely on when writing up, revealing the ‘multiple voices of the self” (Feighery, 2006: 278) in research writing. My ‘split habitus’ (Bourdieu, 2004: 127) means the ‘investigator and the object of investigation are assumed to be interactively linked so that the ‘findings' are literally created as the investigation proceeds’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1998: 207; original emphasis). The bricoleur understands that research is an interactive process shaped by his own personal history, biography, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity and those of the people in the setting. Because of my biography and travel experience, the weight given to my cultural capital (white, European, male, English speaking, heterosexual), but also my (sub)cultural capital (posture, look, previous travel experience) is important to note, since these capitals gave me access to the world that backpackers belong and commit to, often for periods more than a year. My past experiences and ‘nomadic sensibility for routes and rituals’ (D’Andrea, 2006: 113; cf. Clifford, 1997) enabled me to cast a glance upwards, sideways and downwards (Hannerz, 2006) at backpacker practices, movements and meaning so as to understand what was going on in and through their search for of mastery: the ‘criteria of identity’ (Hutchinson et al, 2008: 100) identifiable by indigenous practitioners can emerge. I already had practical knowledge of the ‘field’ and a ‘vernacular’ familiarity with their language, codes, beliefs, dress and values of this world, my accumulative experience of budget travel including a full year travelling between February 2003 and April 2004 providing me with the capacity to read, describe and articulate the practices and processes that drive this world, not from an ethnographic perspective, but from being a member of this world. Since it is this background that created space for the multi-paradigmatic and bricoleur methodology to emerge, it is important to note briefly the story of the self (Feighery, 2006). From an Irish farming background, I did not travel outside Ireland until I was seventeen. At a time of high unemployment (1990-1995) of between seventeen and twenty-two percent\(^85\), I was faced with college fees and expenses. In 1991, two friends and I sought summer employment in Germany, travelling to Frankfurt-am-Main for four months; a ritual, we and other Irish people repeated each summer, as I returned again through 1991 to 1995. During this time, we remained in campsites to curb costs, usually creating an Irish ghetto as larger number arrived each summer. I took the opportunity to travel to other parts

\(^{85}\) www.wrc.ie/publications/regionsw.pdf
of Germany and Europe at the end of each working summer, taking longer breaks to visit surrounding countries such as the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Luxembourg, Belgium and France. After gaining full employment after a Masters degree, I routinely took at least one month each year to travel as a budget independent traveller, culminating my journey during 2003-2004. Given this experience, I was confident in approaching others people and group situations, dispositional traces already internalised from previous travel experiences, dispositions an active force that determines the way that knowledge is obtained.

I do not want to suggest that fieldwork is linear or the exposure to this world unproblematic, but I do argue I have a passion for movement, for people, for communication, observation and listening. Sometimes captivated in ‘total immersion’ of the field, other times I was judgmental of some practices such as drug use. However, EM debars practitioners from imposing any ethical or moral judgment on practices or movements, my presence or absence not meant to destabilise. I agree that researcher interpretation is not wholly objective and at some level reflected my own particular biases. However, when heeding Balibar’s (2002: 100) statement that ‘[w]e are always narcissistically in search of images of ourselves, when it is structures that we should be looking for’, I argue this is both an advantage and disadvantage. This is a world where I feel most comfortable, more so than my academic world. It was not that I could mimic a backpacker through the appropriate language and dress, but I was a backpacker, given they were my people, my type of tourists’ (Graburn, 2002). Similar to Hasting’s (1988) account of schooner sailing in the Pacific or Counts and Counts’ (1996) involvement with American RV owners, they were ‘actors of our own roles, supporting actors in the performance of others, and at other times as part of the audience’ and ‘always an integral part of the myriad of performances taking place around us’ (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2005: 178). My stance, my location of networks of mobility, and space of performance allowed me to listen, learn and interact, my split habitus enabling me to continually access data in the field, stetching my imagination as well as my body – ‘their eyes for observation, their ears for listening, their hands for writing, and so on’ (Janesick, 2000: 380). Practically, deciding how to present oneself, gaining trust and establishing rapport was not as issue, since I was not a novice to the research destinations, backpackers, the route they travelled and their spaces of consumption. Given I had no prior knowledge of others travellers, I knew from my insider position who were

---

86 I was initially accepted on the PhD studentship leading to this text largely because of my previous backpacking experience and my two-year research masters, a dissertation written through a positivistic and quantitative paradigm. The research involved a ‘longitudinal’ study working with large numbers of ‘respondents’, explaining a phenomenon (convention visitors to Ireland) through systematic and statistical relations, an approach that reduced the subjective dimensions of the subjects examined.
eligible, recognising them by sights and through interaction. Indeed, given I spoke a shared language, other backpackers were often very happy to speak to someone with a shared understanding of their practices, movement, or particular situation. Since I moved like other backpackers, I did not have to spend time making contacts, with many other travellers approaching me.

4.7.3 Blogging as Bricoleur.

While my habitual blogging to irish-guy.com during 2003-2004 was a signifying practice, and demonstrated belonging to the world of backpacking during that period, I created nomadx.org in 2005 as part of my academic journey. Chandler (1998) sees personal homepages as a form of bricolage, the appropriation of materials such as images, text, sounds and the code used to generate a particular format helping me in a self-organizing process, as I refer to backpacker articles, businesses, authors, backpackers and their travel stories, over 3,000 entries posting out of passion and an inner need, cutting and pasting with no understanding of any audience, regardless of public (or dissertation supervisor opinion or reward), made with one’s set of skills and knowledge on hand. While many of the entries I posted on www.nomadx.org since the start of my PhD were other people’s pages (usually with some editing because of fair use / copyright), my entries, thoughts, links and so on supported the bricolage and the construction of my identity as bricoleur. According to Chandler (1998) values of the bricoleur are reflected in the assumptions which underlie specific inclusions, allusions, omissions, adaptations and arrangements, as they select, reselect, arrange and rearrange elements until a pattern emerges which seems to satisfy the contraints of the task and the current purposes of the user. Like the bricoalge, a blog is always partial and never completed, the bricoleur using whatever is at hand, using his experience and competence to select and use ‘appropriate’ materials.

*The values of the bricoleur are reflected in the assumptions which underlie specific inclusions, allusions, omissions, adaptations and arrangements ... [This] may seem to suggest that bricolage is a rational, conscious and deliberate practice. But it is seldom like this. Indeed, bricolage lends itself to what may be experienced by the bricoleur as ‘discovery’ rather than planning ... Especially in a virtual medium one may reselect and rearrange elements until a pattern emerges which seems to satisfy the contraints of the task and the current purposes of the user. Indeed, no version of the resulting text need be regarded as final – completion may be endlessly deferred in the medium in which everything is always ‘under construction.’ (Chandler and Roberts-Young, 2000).*
My long-term and continuing engagement in the regularised practice of blogging has contributed to shaping my values; my skill set building over time with the aid of blogging, as does my stockpile of tools and materials (which are archived). Over, time, the bricoleur gets a feel for what types of things may come in handy, and ‘just as all drawings and poems grow out of previous drawings and poems’\textsuperscript{87}, all of the bricoleur’s acts become the groundwork for new acts\textsuperscript{88}.

4.8 Chapter Summary.

Rather than draw up criteria about backpackers or seek to place them in a controlled context, I argued in this chapter for a more holistic approach, one which recognised tourism as a socially constructed and determined phenomenon, one consisting of multiple worlds that are fluid and always in a process of becoming as they are reconstructed and reproduced by their participants. While positivistic or post-positivistic research paradigms have resulted in ‘gaps, silences and misconstructions’ (Tribe, 2006) about backpacking, I utilised the NMP to frame a set of beliefs about the world, acting as a guiding meta-theory without which one might become lost and overwhelmed. Like a paradigm, it acts as ‘a distillation of what we think about the world (but cannot prove)’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1985: 15). Throughout this process, I accepted that humans literally create, shape and adjust their personal and collective worlds, backpackers through self-induced mobility influencing their actions in engagement with others, their world (community) more than the sum of its individual parts. The NMP creates space for researchers to come to terms with a moving world, whether it is commutes to work or those whose worlds demand mobility that yields risky, illegal and extraordinary routes and encounters.

Remedying the neglect and omission of various people, ideas, objects, dangers and ‘authorizing an alternative theoretical and methodological landscape’ (Urry, 2007: 18), a ‘turn’ in tourism studies has led to a breaking down of existing disciplinary boundaries that had made tourism distant from contemporary social life. The NMP redirects attention to the lived, ordinary, practical actions at the centre of backpacking and it liberated me from seizing each encounter as a potential research subject, locating backpacking not through a small sample of individual voices but instead, their patterns of actions, methods and

\textsuperscript{87} Like the poet described by Wordsworth (1837: 500), the bricoleur must be ‘endued with a more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, having a greater knowledge of human nature and a more comprehensive soul than are supposed to be common among mankind; a man pleased with his own passions and volitions, and who rejoices more than other men in the spirit of life that is in him, delighting to contemplate similar volitions and passions as manifested in the going-on of the Universe, and habitually compelled to create them where he does not find them’.

\textsuperscript{88} \url{http://markerstetter.blogspot.com/2010/11/bricolage-bricoleur-what-is-it.html} [Accessed 20-11-2010].
interactions. Using a multi-paradigmatic and bricoleur approach, each phase of ‘field’ research was followed by reflection, interpretation and intensive introspection / (self)-reflection, my reflexive participatory encounter giving way to a interpretative stance as I looked ‘for culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world’ (Crotty, 1998: 67), ‘attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomenon in terms of the meanings people bring to them’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000: 3). While using an EM approach, this was not an EM study as I sought to build a through a bricolage to understand backpacker practices, movement and representations. By linking practices with more abstract knowledge framed by the NMP and pulling away from participation and observation long enough to interpret them⁸⁹; the objective was to render explicit what is taken for granted, stepping back and picking up the pieces of what is left, and sewing them together by engaging in different perspectives, readings, structures, processes, discourses, activities, literature, narratives, stories, concepts and theories (Kincheloe, 2001). ‘Stepping back’ means supplying the ‘missing detail’ asking ‘how are [things] produced in the first place so as to be recognizable as the things they are’ (Hester and Frances, 2007: 6). After participating and studying ‘everyday life’, the result is a bricolage, a reflexive, collage-like creation that represents the researchers interpretations of the world or phenomenon under analysis. It does not break with the work produced through disciplinary research from the past but enables the knowledge, stories, myths and information that flow in this world to be interpreted relatively freely ‘from rationalising assumptions of dominant methods and paradigms’ (Coles et al, 2006: 295), my bricolage developing through field data, reflection and writing in a style that is evocative of the experiences of the participants and the complexity of their world.

While the bricolage exists out of respect for the complexity of the lived world, it work provides guidance in making meaning from the data, and rendering participants movement and practices as well as representations into readable conceptual (theoretical) interpretations. The following chapters seek to capture this world, one where backpackers, through human practice, sustain and reproduce it. Bourdieu’s ‘theory of the art of practice’ (Certeau, 1988: 43) routinely called ‘theory of practice’, (Bourdieu, 1977) enabling me to revise, broaden and complicate our understanding of the phenomena under consideration, while retaining the integrity of the phenomena being investigated, balancing the conceptual analysis of participants and their world stories while still creating a sense of their presence

⁸⁹ A performance presupposes a practice, and practice presupposes performances.
and other voices in the final text. I argue any attempt to disentangle practice and theory to focus on them separately would have either provide a theoretical stance with no real lived or embodied substance or provide more cardboard cut out typologies. Through repeated phases of research, reflection and writing, ‘the nodes, the nexuses, the linkages, the interconnections, the fragile bonds between disciplines, between bodies of knowledge, between knowing and understanding themselves’ (Lincoln, 2001: 693-694) were investigated, the bricolage often ‘a spark to researcher creativity’ (Kincheloe, 2001: 687), as they thread their research through ‘a variety of conceptual maps’ (Kincheloe, 2008) to make a previously repressed features of the social world visible. My bricolage then, rather than a rational, conscious and deliberate practice, lends itself to what may be experienced by the bricoleur as ‘discovery’ rather than planning.

By revising and applying Bourdieu’s concepts of field, capital and habitus, I attempt to illustrate how this world sustains itself. Like the epistemological and methodological thread running through this chapter, Bourdieu’s work focuses on practices rather than what on people say, and while ‘it is not possible to read other minds … it may be possible to step into other shoes’ (Jenkins, 2003: 50). While the concept of objectivity is rejected, with no perfect outcome or ‘right’ answer (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998), the ‘measure of my work is whether it adds to our knowledge of the world and our understanding of ourselves or enhances life, not whether it follows methodological rules precisely’ (Relp, 1981b: 112). I argue any reader, backpacker or academic can make the connections between the bricolage and the data from which it was derived, since the bricolage could not have developed without the fieldwork, and therefore meets the researcher’s ethical obligation to ‘describe the experiences of others in the most faithful way possible’ (Munhall, 2007: 504), my voice as author ‘bringing fragments of fieldwork time, context, and mood together in a colloquy of the author’s several selves — reflecting, witnessing, wondering, accepting — all at once’ (Charmaz and Mitchell, 1996: 299). Following Richardson (2000) and her metaphor of the crystal, I argue the bricolage, like a crystal, ‘expands, mutates, and alters while at the same time reflecting and refracting the ‘light’ of the social world. New patterns emerge and new shapes dance on’ (Kincheloe, 2004c: 21-22).
Chapter Five: Travellerscapes (Scapes) and the Field.
5.1. Introduction.

In order to understand the backpacking phenomena, one must understand the power of the imagination, the flow of movement being the flow of the mind; backpacker mobility coalescing to appropriate and reproduce imaginative and lived landscapes of mobility and practice in which they seek an intimate and personal engagement; forming a social, temporal, material and spatial concept – a distinctive imagined world (community) that serves as a catalyst for unfulfilled participatory needs and desires. This world is powerful enough to seduce individuals to undertake new and sometimes irreversible paths, their attachment to a single place or nation loosening as individuals dwell in a world of movement, relationships, memories and histories, shaping and reshaping social relations and routines as they journey through borders and across towns and continents. I argue that the countercultural imagination materialised in the drift east, working across national borders, transforming subjectivities and producing shared cognitive principles and beliefs, creating an emerging world I term ‘travellerscapes’ (scapes), landscapes of mobility and practice realigning the parameters of belonging, making movement possible but also, ultimately, desirable as individuals negotiate a belonging and attachment as they move through cultural, social and physical space, encountering and negotiating with others in that space.

The bricolage enabled me to focus my attention on the social, cultural, and political economic forces that shape this world, raising unasked questions about the world in which backpackers move, the ways in which this world is produced, with shifting boundaries and continually being redefined and redesigned through mobility. The bricoleur—one who makes what is needed out of available materials creates a continuous bricolage meaning no description are fixed and final in seeking to reshape and sophisticate social theory. In exploring the complexity of the world in which backpackers move, one must explore that which is not apparent. Drawing on Appadurai’s five dimensions of global cultural flow and his concept of ‘imagined worlds’, Anderson’s (1983) ‘imagined communities’ and Bourdieu’s concept of field, this chapter explores a space made of movement, rhythm and lived practices - layered and imposed upon real places to offer a sense of identification, affiliation and belonging. Socially constructed and always in a process of becoming, it is a world one can see, feel, touch, smell, but only through ones embodied mobility and participation in this world; yielding encounters with a world with its own logic, agents, institutions and specific capital. It is transformative and open to transformation, readable by
anyone who is literate in their use. I uncover them, not simply as a solid physical entity or destination enacted in particular places and through particular others linked by a ‘habitual bond’ (Casey, 2001) but their rules of contiguity, convention and association, materialising and visible to its inhabitants as they produce a differentiated force that shapes and reflects their ‘being-in-the-world’. For those who enter this world through self-induced and controlled mobility, ‘it is enacted at every instant in the movement of existence’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 89) at, between, within and across the world, the lived body ‘caught in the fabric of the world’ (ibid, pp. 256), their claim for a new subjectively generating practices that leave ‘traces of varying degrees of solidity, opacity or permanence’ (Shanks and Tilley, 1992: 131) and dispositional traces in the body itself. Therefore, like de Certeau, the aim is ‘to locate the practices that are foreign to the ‘geometrical’ or ‘geographical’ space of visual, panoptic or theoretical constructions’ (de Certeau, 1988: 154), my specific competencies, skill and knowledge able to ‘read’ the scapes, my critical reflexivity a form of capital since I am ‘one of them’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1962: 135), my previous travels allowing me to see ‘because I am situated amidst a world of seeing’ (Wylie, 2002: 445). While it would have been possible to present large amounts of data in relation to many of the almost ‘common-sense’ (Silverman, 2001) issues arising from my field research, it seemed more important to focus on the conceptualisations that emerge from the data. The chapter derives from fresh data, and seeks to ensure that different voices are heard. It demanded a means of ‘feeling’ mobility (Thrift, 1994), participating in patterns of movement as a form of sustained immersive engagement so as to reveal the competencies, skills and knowledge to feel at ease and get ahead in this world. It means not simply looking but also and thinking and feeling their world, reality arising from the interactive process and its temporal, cultural, spatial and structural contexts. Over seven months, I travelled with and amongst them, seeking to belong and demonstrate belonging to the same landscapes of mobility and practice as every other backpacker, traversing the same learning trajectory as I sought reassurance of my performance, learning and interacting, moving bodily to sensation-to-sensation, body-to-body and place-to-place.

5.2. Land, landscape to the Travellerscapes.

The concept of destination lies at the heart of tourism (Cooper and Hall, 2008), bringing individuals to a place, product, region or country; staying for a period so as to consume it and then return home. While land is a place is ‘lived in’ (Cresswell, 2003), a tourism destination is the ‘geographic location to which a person is traveling’ (Metelka, 1990: 46),
defined by the World Tourism Organization’s Working Group on Destination Management as:

**physical space in which a visitor spends at least one overnight. It includes tourism products such as support services and attractions, and tourism resources within one day's return travel time. It has physical and administrative boundaries defining its management, and images and perceptions defining its market competitiveness. Local destinations incorporate various stakeholders often including a host community, and can nest and network to form larger destinations.**

A destination acts as a ‘container’ where tourist activities, events, attractions, transport and accommodation are located, offered to consumers as an integrated experience, ‘in a geographical region and physical setting, which its visitors understand as a unique entity’ (Moilanen and Rainisto, 2009: 112). An alternative view however, starts from the distinction between places of land and places of landscape, recognising space as a medium rather than a container for action, ‘something that is involved in action and cannot be divorced from it’ (Tilley, 1994: 10). While land is ‘a physical, tangible resource to be ploughed, sown, grazed and built upon, a place of functional work’ (Urry, 2007: 256), whose history and geography are known in detail, the origins of the term ‘landscape’ are traced to the 19th century German ideal of *landschaft*, with includes the principle of land, but also the viewpoint of this area of land tied to the perspective of an individual from a particular location (Olwig, 1996). A ‘working country is hardly ever a landscape’ (Williams, 1973: 120) and while ‘places of land’ can be viewed in locational terms as a specific geographical coordinate (Cooper and Hall, 2008), landscape refers to an intangible resource that is highly ideological given they create distinct ways of seeing, enabling people to take possession of environments even if temporarily (Tilley, 1994). Whether through canvas, in writing or on the ground, as a medium, it is ‘determined not only by the cultural background of the consumer, but also by the environmental, political and cultural processes that lead to the creation’ (Cooper and Hall, 2008: 113). Arjun Appadurai (1990, 1996) proposes that these landscapes are now so globalised as to cause cultural waves, his vision of global cultural flows, where ideas and imaginations get passed on through bodies and commodities such as film, enabling more mobilities and flows to be created. Using the ‘-scapes’ suffix, he focuses on the transnational distributions of correlated elements illustrated by the transnational arrangements of people, technological, finance, media, and political resources that distribute, place and connect cultural practices. Labeling them ethnoscapes, technoscapes, finanscapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes (see figure 1), these deeply disjunctive and unpredictable elements are the building blocks of the
imagined worlds and cut across conventional political and social boundaries, as ‘individuals and groups seek to annex the global into their own practices of the global’ (Appadurai, 1996: 4).

**Figure 1:** Appadurai’s (1996) five dimensions of ‘Global Cultural Flows’.

Technoscapes are the distribution of both mechanical and informational technologies at high speeds across national boundaries and around the globe. Financescapes are the flow of megamonies (capital) through currency markets, stock exchanges and commodity speculations but also including the global credit card society and money transfer operations such as Western Union. Mediascapes describe the worldwide distribution of image-centred, narrative based accounts of reality and the infrastructure required to produce and disseminate them. Ideoscapes are also concatenations (chains) of images, but they are more explicitly political, relating to the ideologies of states and the counter-ideologies of social movements. Finally, are the ethnoscapes: the ‘landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live’ (Appadurai, 1991: 192) and include immigrants, refugees, package tourists, exiles, guest workers and other groups on the move in a more globalised world. These different landscapes of globalisation take place in relation to one another and ‘represent the fluid irregularity of the global flows as well as the multitude of agents and means by which globalization takes place’ (Penttinen, 2008: 40).

Appadurai argues these are the building block for imagined worlds, the fluid irregular
landscapes that look different from multiple perspectives and angles of vision, each giving a differing interpretation; landscapes that might be navigated by agents who both experience and constitute larger formations, ‘in part from their own sense of what these landscapes offer (Appadurai, 1996: 32-33). Building on Anderson’s (1983) ‘imagined communities’ of nationhood that emerged during the seventeenth century, Appadurai’s ‘imagined worlds’ (Appadurai, 1996) are ‘deeply perspectival constructs, inflected very much by the historical, linguistic and political situatedness of different sorts of actors’ (Appadurai, 1990: 296). Constituted by the ‘historically situated imaginations of persons and groups spread around the globe’ (Appadurau, 1996: 33) and unleashed by electronic media and mass mobility, these worlds constitute new forms of individual and collective expression, creating a backdrop to action, continually in construction and constantly been added to ‘because their constitution takes place as part of the day-to-day praxis or practical activity of individuals and groups in the world’ (Tilley, 1994: 10). In providing a particular setting for involvement, individuals can claim a particular subjectivity within these symbolically constructed worlds, a certain ‘being-in-the-world’ oriented through embodied skills, sensory engagements and corporeal involvement in patterned use of space and time, the incorporation of dispositions, conventions and systems of belief influencing their everyday decisions and evaluations and becoming semioticians as they read (and consume) a world (or worlds) while on the move.

Rather than a space of a state, defined by maps and rules or a tourism landscape inscribed with pre-established signs (though they can overlap), these worlds emerge through the practice and performances of ‘doing’ and ‘being’, and can become represented and articulated in writing, images, stories and narratives. These imagined worlds or scapes encompass the mental, symbolic, social, material and the physical linked by an abstract quality, which is qualitative rather than quantitative. Form the motorist’s embodied experience of the vernacular landscape or ‘motorscape’ (Edensor, 2004b); to ‘faithscapes’ (Edensor, 2004a) ‘sexscapes’ (Brennan, 2004; Penttinen, 2008), ‘railscapes’ (Fredrickson, 2003), ‘nightscapes’, ‘playscapes’ (Chatterton and Hollands, 2002), ‘borderscapes’ (Rajaram and Grundy-Warr, 2007), cityscapes, seascapes, kinscapes, clanscapes, waterscapes, skatescapes and tourismscapes (Van Duim, 2007a,b); landscapes of mobility and practices are transformed into landscapes of circulation, proximity and movement through patterned use of space and time, where mutual experiences exist beyond instrumental interests and needs. Scapes then are a complex space that has been cast over, drawn from and / or are imposed upon lived locales, peoples, communities and
cultures, a way of seeing and belonging that can ‘mask’ the land and its inhabitants beneath.

I argue that the countercultural imagination created an imagined world (community) I term ‘travellerscapes’ (scapes) from which those who felt excluded by the logic of a dominant culture could operate, the drift east creating new space-time paths / patterns / rhythms and a world to which they could belong in response to feelings of disempowerment. A powerful imagination crossed over land and its people, crossing over borders and boundaries, creating landscapes that became recognised and organised into coherent patterns that were shared by individuals at an individual and collective level. The countercultural imagination created fantasies of possible lives and a new collective space that was not territorially bounded to any one destination, location, region, territory or country, access not restricted to one class or nationality. As much fantasy as real, it drew tens of thousands of individuals between and across a deterritorialised ‘landscape of scapes’, becoming bound up with images, aspirations, identifications based what this world could offer rather than one particular destination. As in any form of touristic movement, it does not begin with the act of touring, but the imagination, that renders the world ‘picturable’ (Crang, 1997a), ‘tourable’ (Alneng, 2002), ‘intellible’ (MacCannell, 1976), legible, happenable and performable. The scapes are ‘a strange toponymy that is detached from actual places and flies high over the city like a foggy geography of ‘meaning’ held in suspension [...] a second, poetic geography on top of the geography of the literal, forbidden or permitted meaning’ (De Certeau, 1988: 104–5). They constitute an ‘imagined world’ (community) that is moved through, consumed, practiced and performed into being, always in play, never completed and always in a process of becoming.

Today, this world remains as a symbolic, material, visual and mental-map which individuals can relate and which they identify both at an individual and collective level, and even though its meanings may be difficult to articulate and verbalise, the recast scapes providing the relabeled backpackers with routes, places, rhythms and stakes in which to organise their everyday life. There is no definition of the ‘travellerscapes’, and any attempt to do so would rectify the concept and overlook the fluid, flexible and irregular ways it is imagined, lived and produced. While I use the concept of scapes, I argue these travellerscapes constitute a global social ‘field’ which is a key concept of Bourdieu’s ‘theory of practice’. I argue these scapes constitute a global field with its own particular norms, logic, stakes and fundamental truths. Bourdieu may have only recognised the travellerscapes as a sub-field
of an overarching ‘leisure field’ (Gayo-Cal, 2006), backpackers playing the ‘tourism game’ differently from others. However, Bourdieu’s concept was trapped within a sovereign nation-state centered framework and didn’t account for how global flows of people, images, information, knowledge, norms, technologies and capital could become the building blocks of emerging social worlds that can be simultaneously global, national and local. Like Marginson (2008), I argue Appadurai’s ‘scapes’ are a more suitable expression with as ‘many fields of preferences as there are fields of stylistic possibilities’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 226). Therefore, I argue that the scapes / field is a ‘separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy’ (Bourdieu, 1993: 163), ‘an autonomous universe endowed with specific principles of evaluation of practices and works’ (ibid, 163); ‘a relational configuration endowed with a specific gravity’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 17). They are a space of struggle, conflict, competition and creativity, existing to the extent that entering ‘players’ believe in, and actively pursue the prizes it offers (Wacquant, 1992: 19) while accepting the implicit norms and regularities that define it’s functioning. Like the artist in the literary field or scientist in the scientific field, the backpacker is inseparable from the field and its ‘progressive invention of a particular social game’, which is constituted as it ‘establishes its autonomy, that is to say, its specific laws of functioning, within the field of power’ (Bourdieu, 1993: 163). Bourdieu speaks of the ‘field’ as a ‘separate social universe’, a ‘particular social game’, and ‘sites of struggles’ determined by structure and relative positions. These landscapes of mobility are ‘felt’ to be real, every field being ‘a space of relations which is just as real as a geographic space’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 232), but ‘freed form a certain number of the constraints that characterize the encompassing social universe, a universe that is somewhat apart, endowed with its own laws, its own nomos, its own law of functioning, without being completely independent of the external laws’ (Bourdieu, 2005b: 33). Like any social universe (Unruh, 1980: 277) they are ‘not necessarily defined by formal boundaries, membership lists, or spatial territory. . . . A social world must be seen as an internally recognizable constellation of actors, organizations, events, and practices which have coalesced into a perceived sphere of interest and involvement for participants. Characteristically, a social world lacks a powerful centralized authority structure and is delimited by . . . effective communication and not territory nor formal group membership’.

5.3 A Short History of the Scapes.

The imagination is a powerful force and is described by Appadurai as something more than
a kind of individual faculty for escaping the real, imagined worlds (communities) overlaying ‘a more tangible geography and help shape our attitudes to other places and people’ (May, 1996: 57), altering an individuals understanding of themselves as they construct and ascribe meaning to these worlds and allowing these worlds to envelop them. For many, this imagination is not linked to mobility fantasies or chaos but rather to worlds that take them beyond it, as many seek and achieve to reconstruct worlds around them, worlds that inform their lives, their belonging to time-space and answering questions about who they are. However, as Tuan (1998: xv) points out, the imagination can lead individuals ‘astray – into … the unreal, and the grotesque, and can tempt so into first picturing, then (too often) acting out evil’. One must only look to the mobility fantasies that have led to global sexscapes where young women are forced to perform (often the exotic Other). Good or bad, these worlds are mapped imaginatively, materially, discursively, strategically, geographically and symbolically, encompassing entire cultural and mental area’s that cut across territorial boundaries, traditional political boundaries and borders; traversing over multiple physical locations, peoples and cultures, while drawing from them. Promoted by niche and mass media, these imagined worlds (communities) can create a flow of people, images, technologies, ideologies, and capital to create novel ‘uncertain landscapes’ (Appadurai, 1996). Build on a disjuncture between global scapes, I argue the counterculture emerged, which generated forceful desires, needs and fantasies, the rapidly expanding and quickening mobility of images, myths, ideologies, gossip, stories, letters, ideas and people, combined with innovations in transport and communications creating the drift east, ‘free space’ seen and represented as timeless, exotic and organic. As stories, images and myths met already deterritorialised viewers, the popular iconography of ‘the East’ became an image freighted with meanings so powerful that the real places upon which the those images were built scarcely mattered since they fulfilled participatory desires and needs. The drift could only have happened during a pivotal time in world history. Individuals rather than advancing an ideology through politics deployed a countercultural imagination to construct a narrative of a new world, a ‘world vision’ advancing a particular understanding of the world by their very use of time-space, imagined and sustained through and with others. I argued their sense of place extended out from the enclaves and from the present encounter upon a larger temporal and spatial field of relationships and signifying practices that shaped their sense of time-space and an evolving collective identity. For period between 1965-1975, people who had a very different perspective evoked and reified a collective imagination not just through maps, stories, images, novels and poetry, cafes, freak buses but also through daily social interactions and
habitual practices and (often negative) media representations so as to escape the conventions of their homelands.

A world made of many worlds opened a space and established its right to exist, raised the banner of being necessary, stuck itself in the middle of the earth’s reality to announce a better future. A world of all the worlds that rebel and resist Power. (Marcos, 2004: 113)

The countercultural imagination was carried on the body, onto their vehicles, clothes, letters and language in a tactical maneuvering of avoidance, the journey creating a distinct ‘travel style’, their movement a reflection and a generator of deeply felt passions, commitments, attachment and emotions. Soon becoming relevant to identity formation, from which a sense of place was derived, the drift east was bound up with aspirations and desire as individual’s self-reflexively positioned themselves in relation to others, calling attention to perceived affinities, similarities and trajectories. Over time, continual socio-spatial articulation offered new sociabilities and proximities, cementing the importance of specific sites, objects, places, sights and activities that became more than simply a collection of physical buildings, squares, places, events, hotels and roads. Producing landscapes of mobility and practice, this worlds inhabitants rejected much of their middle classes aesthetic training, education, economic and cultural capital, their values not based on the cultural capital derived from the social class from which many of them belonged. Creating an alternative spatial rendering that was not ‘fixed’ or ‘topographic’ as a typical landscape might, these ‘travellerscapes’ (scapes) acted as a ‘cognitive map’ (Jameson, 1990), providing a medium for (rather than a container) for and outcome of action and previous histories of action (Tilley, 1994), structured by a logic and a set of relational places, linked by paths, movements and narratives, practiced, performed and repeated, mapped and narrated until put into words and maps by guidebook publishers. Drawing heavily from real places and people, they followed networks of mobility that crossed towns, cities, countries and continents; throught which people, ideas, objects, knowledge and capital flowed, the centre of the scapes becoming littered with objects, heads, freaks, institutions, money, hostels, money exchange offices, enclaves, cafes, which as an assemblage had a resonance, practical use and symbolic value, developing as a world that could be be visited, seen, felt and touched. This enabled individuals to make sense of this world and their place in it, and while some only partially belonged to this space, others developed greater commitment, moving through cultural, social and physical space, building dispositions, which are stances, which were sufficiently similar for social interaction to occur.
Labelled drifters, their performances of now coherent routes contributed to the stabilisation and regulation of the scapes, making them coherent, legible, and readable, so that they could be encountered in a planned and practical way. Produced through the force of their own energy, they produced information, capital, ideas, images, gossip, cyclosheets, guestbook’s and notice boards. They helped interpret the road east by providing a scale, giving people security and confidence that the trip was happenable and performable. This drift became a flow, the road engulfing those who journeyed, making their movement visible, their ‘play90 power’ discovered, labeled and mapped, becoming ‘represented and presented space, both a signifier and a signified, both a frame and what a frame contains, both a real place and its simulacrum, both a package and the commodity inside the package’ (Mitchell, 1994: 5). While the drifters tactical maneuvering and struggle make the drift east happen, creating a landscape of mobility and practice, its boundaries mapped and enforced by the drifters themselves, their bodies, ideas, objects, knowledge and capital wrote materially on real land and concrete locales. This became an open challenge to many who derived their identity from more locally anchored meanings. Since this world could not exist without places, conflict arose between divergent imagined worlds – whether they were nation states constituting law and order, families and even religions. As the imagined world was challenged, the scapes were and those who positioned themselves within it were pressurised. The York Times had reported as early as 1968 that ‘Laos has grown disenchanted with the flower power folk, Thailand will not let them in without a haircut, and Japan now requires a bond of $250 as proof of financial stability91. The hope they could conform to the tourist role filed, but even after been closed down, the scapes remained a symbol of human desire, but only becoming a visible medium for and an outcome of action again in the 1980’s. The world again allowed individuals whose embodied and reflexive movement across the scapes produced dispositions to act and believe, deposited in persons as a result of a belief or illusio in what this world could offer, a world which must be investigated in greater detail.

5.4 The Media and the Scapes.

All societies have been challenged by a fundamental change in traditional ‘ethnoscapes’, as globalisation creates landscapes of migrants, tourists, refugees and non-state actors,

90 ‘Play has a Dionysian character, entertaining the unbridled and the uncivilized in the interest of manipulating the world to its own design. While this tendency can be a source of creativity, it can also lead to deviance of one kind or another. Indeed, the tendency to idealize and romanticize play must be tempered with the realization that playful impulses may be “dirty”, antisocial, degenerate and even destructive. Torturing the cat may be great sport for a couple of five year olds’ (Kleiber, 1999: 68–69).
91 http://www.vagablogging.net/2003/07
producing and been produced by globally disseminated information, images and mobility fantasies (Appadurai, 1996: 35-6). Where once drifting was represented in and through notice boards, myths, stories, countercultural leaders and letters to the underground press, there is now a tremendous output of images, stories, gossip and information about backpacking circulating within the scapes but also within global mass media. Appadurai used the term ‘mediascapes’ to refer to both the distribution of the electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information (the Internet, magazines, newspapers, television stations and film studios) as well as the images created by these media. I argue the underground press and alternatives guidebooks were central to the emergence of this world and the transmission of its logic and values, and in the process, created desire for first hand experiences (Jansson, 2007). Inscribed in images, representations, symbols, narrative, text and video that circulate and flow across newspapers, bookshelves, cinemas and television screens; from backpacker websites, magazines, films, television shows, literary fiction, guidebooks, and a background component within movies, book plots, charity appeals, documentaries and reality shows, there are now a ‘large and complex repertoires of images, narratives, and ethnoscapes to viewers throughout the world’ (Appadurai, 1996: 35).

From ‘backpacker’ movies such as ‘Touristas’ and ‘Wolf Creek’ to twitter and blog updates from celebrity backpackers such as Kate Winslet, Charlize Theron, Cameron Diaz, Anthony Kiedis and Matthew McConaughey, the deployment of images, stories and characters surrounding this world has never been so visible, outlining possible lives, possible futures and new paths – partially scripting a role and mapping movement. While budget independent travel existed long before the drifters, with poets, painters, servants, settlers, traders, soldiers, missionaries aspiring through their imagination to seek, change and appropriate the world with their own meanings and mobility fantasies (MacCannell, 1999), often forming extensive links across the globe, many of these connections were forced through war, religion, trade and colonisation. While tourism has grown considerably since its emergence in the 19th century, guidebooks available in the 1960’s were ‘the hallmark of sedate, middle class tourism’ (Cohen, 1973: 96) and drifters believed they spoiled the spontaneity of their experiences. Instead, they chaotically produced their own spatial stories and produced / consumed their own media where they could imagine themselves to be members of a global way of life.

92 ‘Traditional’ guidebooks (Baedeker, Michelin, Green Guides, and Hachette Guides Bleues) were aimed at the serious cultural and sightseeing tourist, with little or no subjective comment (Palnowski, 2002; Horner and Swarbrooke, 2003).
Information for the counterculture was an obsession, one that created hundreds of countercultural ‘zines’ newspapers, magazines and newsletters, becoming an integral part of their way of life (Rycroft, 2003; Streitmatter, 2001), with Neville (1970:120) warning ‘[i]f you don’t read Underground papers you don’t know what’s going on in the world’ working for their ‘individual users and for the larger collective entities to which those users belong (Kosher, 2000: 6). They created a unified field of exchange and communication in everyday immediate and personal experience (Anderson, 1993: 44-45), transporting ideas and meanings that were social, spatial and cultural over time and space. The underground press developed an intimate relationship with this generation, spreading countercultural ideas all over America and Europe, promoting revolution by breaking down sexual taboos, offering drugs advice, fighting for social justice and placing symbolic emphasis on the power of drugs, music and mobility, helping shape and sustain the countercultural imagination by offering admission into a way of life and creating a unified field for communication and exchange. From about 1965, when they first appeared to their high point in the early 70’s, there were 200-500 publications been produced regularly (Lewis, 1972; Neville, 1970; Rycroft, 2003; Streitmatter, 2001), the majority based around distinct geographic locales such as universities and particular towns and cities. While many of them were small and financially stretched, news syndication services like the Y.I.P. News Service, W.I.N.D. News Service, Underground Press Syndicate and the Liberation News Service syndicated news and features all over the world from one underground paper to another (Farber, 1994). As political content diminished in the late 1960’s, stories covering other ‘scenes’ and other locations increased, mobilising powerful desires, fantasies and imaginative geographies. Many activist organizations ‘began to privilege personal liberation through counter hegemonic lifestyles over direct political action, thus facilitating the development of youth-based countercultures’ (Kearney, 2006: 56).

By 1969, regular stories about the East appeared, making the journey desirable, plausible and possible. While mainstream guides emphasised upscale attractions, luxury and exclusiveness, directing tourists to ‘safe and respectable locations and instructed them in proper conduct’ (Ohmann, 1996: 158), ‘affording them cognitive and esthetic familiarity with a world in with only those with decent incomes and educations freely moved’ (ibid, 158), the counterculture profoundly rejected this straight societal conformity when promoting travel. As individuals headed east, the underground press was soon recording their thoughts through articles and letters and championed travel as a counter hegemonic form
of cultural practice. By recording the scapes as a circuit of established symbolic places, they created an imagined geography that invited a dispersed population to follow, making their readers understand their own relation to that space. The letters to the underground press and the authors of travel pieces were near evangelical in tone, giving themselves and those who read them a cultural credibility by linking the counterculture to a mobility fantasy93, providing a ‘a position within a set of shared meanings gives us a sense of ‘who we are’; ‘where we belong’ – a sense of our own identity’ (Hall, 1997: 3). Along with spatial stories, letters, gossip, guest books, notice boards, and phone calls, the underground press helped structure and map this world, linking places together, producing particular judgments about the worth of specific activities, sites, routes, practices and people, all of which could be positioned around the individual during the course of the journey. The early 70’s saw the emergence of the first ‘alternative guidebooks’ that kept travellers ‘informed about themselves’ (Thrift, 1994). These ‘guidebooks of the counter culture’ (Cohen, 1973) were not guidebooks in the modern sense and included the June 1971 edition of The Whole Earth Catalog which devoted a page to the ‘Overland Guide to Nepal’ and the BIT Guide to India (BIT Guide was produced by the BIT94 Information and Help Service in London in 1970) which was described as a stapled-together A4 bundle. Other ‘guidebooks’ soon followed; such as Neville’s ‘Play Power’ (1970) which was a subjective analysis of travel within Thailand, Laos, Nepal, Turkey, Afghanistan and Morocco.

These ‘guidebooks’ covered areas and overland routes not covered by existing guidebooks, which tended to avoid overland routes when getting to a destination by boat or plane. Written by the drifters themselves and passed on physically and orally in narrative form, they became topics of conversation and objects of value. These ‘underground travel guides’ (Riley, 1988) became representations of drifting and were not suspected of being commercialised, as they suggested individuals defy inaccessibility and avoid inauthenticity in the most cost-effective way possible (Caruana et al, 2008). They reduced the dependence on visitor books and notice boards, becoming a medium with the ability to hold and transfer information from one cohort to the next. It wasn’t until the early 1970’s that the first ‘proper’ guidebooks were published about the already established routes and included Frommer’s ‘South America on $10 a day’ (1969) and ‘India on $5 to $10 a day’ (1970).

93 By the early 70’s, symbolic routes were been written about and shared with route guides to India appearing in the underground press. Issue 36 (July, 1971) of ‘Oz’ detailed an ‘Indian Summer’, the beach scene and the ‘kind-hearted’ Goans, straightforward and honest who left the beaches to the ‘heads’ and the networks north. Issue 25 (December, 1969) in an article called ‘Syringes, naked breasts and all that shit’ detailed a summer in Ibiza, where the author ‘was still into work. The old idea’ before she became socialised into this new world where she ‘did not have to live with that guilt’.

94 BIT was described by Lewis (1972: 84) as the ‘Community Switchboard and Street Aid), a ‘24-hour information and coordinating service’ (Neville, 1970: 41) and as well as producing a guidebook, provided information for walk in visitors.
However, it was Tony and Maureen Wheeler’s ‘Lonely Planet’ publication, ‘Across Asia on the Cheap’ (1973) that made the most dramatic impact on drifting. Based on the Wheelers own journey east in 1972, and primarily based on the BIT guide which they had taken with them (Wheeler and Wheeler, 2007), they aligned themselves squarely within the emerging countercultural climate at the time, inscribing in their readers imagination a very clear map of this new world. Rather than being produced for a German or British market or for a definable social class, they mobilised cultural knowledge for a dispersed readership, guaranteeing the promise of individual agency, mapping what that been previously transmitted orally. Recording the practices of those who had ‘dropped out of the 9 to 5 rat race’ (Wheeler, 1973: i), the guide and the publishers began to occupy a strategic position with in the scapes by attaining great symbolic power. These ‘alternative’ guidebooks began to ‘assess a kind of seismic quality in a changing culture [of transplanted peoples], an epicenter that releases a suddenly fissured crack’ on the global surface of human culture (Harris, 1983: 127), as the work of cultural imagination by the drifters become an expression or a “fissured crack,” in a larger landscape.

When Lonely Planet (LP) responded to a recovering economy in the early to mid 1980’s to launch a new series of country guidebooks in addition to the traditional ‘overland’ and ‘shoestring’ guides which had proved so successful in the early 1970’s, they helped reignite this countercultural imagination, preventing the ritual, cultural and mythological significance of places to become lost and forgotten, the texts acting as a repository of countercultural nostalgia, and in doing so retained the symbolic power to speak on this worlds behalf. Like the BIT travel guide, the LP guidebooks were without advertising and were often made up entirely of reader’s letters and advice. The Wheelers also retained the services of travel writers such as Geoff Crowther who had presided over the BIT travel guide production. As a visual medium they created an intimate relationship with their readers throughout the 1980’s and 1990’s that seemed to directly reflect the needs of independent budget travellers, reproducing the fundamental truths of this world. Their symbolic power can be described as:

_a power of constituting the given through utterances, of making people see and believe, of confirming or transforming the vision of the world and, thereby, action on the world and thus the world itself, an almost magical power which enables one to obtain the equivalent of what is obtained through force (whether physical or economic), by virtue of the specific effect of mobilization - is a power that can be exercised only if it is recognized, that is, misrecognized as arbitrary. . . What creates the power of words and slogans, a power capable of maintaining or subverting the social order, is the belief in the legitimacy of words_
and of those who utter them. And words alone cannot create this belief (Bourdieu,

Within this context, symbolic power can influence the actions of others, and like a painter,
the Wheelers depicted a world where individuals could recognise themselves in the text
and in the authors (the Wheelers). Myths surrounded their counter-cultural credentials, with
stories routinely circulating within the scapes about their lives and supposed untimely
deaths while undertaking risky travelling (Hutnyk, 1996: 54-55; Wheeler and Wheeler,
2007: 175-176). The guidebook purchase became a ritual part of individuals disembedding
from their old lives, where reading and use confirmed individual participation. It allowed
individuals to argue that early these guidebooks provided for a sense of independence and
autonomy unavailable from more middle class guidebooks like Baedeker which listed
hotels of ‘the highest class’ (MacCannell, 1999: 61) as well as providing an alternative to
more conventional charter-tourist travel and group congregation (Noy, 2005). Their more
subjective approach to travel in comparison to the middle class guidebooks subtly
confirmed a distinction between them and the ‘ordinary’ tourist (Riley, 1988; Sørensen,
2003), their widespread adoption meaning individuals were ‘continually reassured that the
imagined world is visibly rooted in everyday life’ (Anderson, 1983). Even though many early
guidebooks were ‘a colorful farrago of truth and lies, advice and highs’ (Wheeler and
Wheeler, 2007: 8), Anderson argues that ‘fiction seeps quietly and continuously into reality’,
‘the act of reading it is so closely bound up with various other practices: looking, walking,
eating, drinking, sleeping, and so on’ (Gilbert and Henderson, 2002: 123) as to blur any
distinction. Even though guidebooks make it easier to share experiences and form a
common experiential frame of references, they ask the reader to view the scapes through a
single vantage point, ‘a form of complicity which is neither passive submission to external
constraint nor a free adherence to values’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 51). The Wheeler’s symbolic
capital brought high symbolic profits and the confidence to feel authorised to speak on
backpackers behalf, the guides themselves producing an authorised language and ‘way of
seeing the social world’ (Bourdieu 1991: 106) drawing on the scapes (social field) for
authority, soon authorised to speak on the behalf of its constituents, and in turn providing
its readers with a world that is reducible, comprehensible and straightforward, their once
irrelevant nature becoming irrevocably linked to backpackers in the eighties. Of course,
backpackers remain the final arbiters, since the Wheelers\textsuperscript{95} and the Lonely Planet are not

\textsuperscript{95} During October 2007, a 75% stake in the Lonely Planet company was purchased by BBC Worldwide, the commercial arm of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), while the Wheelers retained the remaining 25%. They sold this remaining share to BBC Worldwide in February, 2011. The Wheeler’s are to remain on as brand ambassadors on an ad hoc basis.
autonomous in decreeing the value of practices and products (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977).

Mobilising the imagination (and mobility), their power in writing the scapes into being should not be underestimated, since they don’t point to what ‘could’ be seen, but what ‘ought’ to be seen (Koshar, 2000) and are ‘intentionally evaluative; by omission and inclusion’ (Ling, 2003: 270), mapping the scapes onto reality by the contrivance of spatially articulated itineraries and attractions (determining or reproducing the value of (sub)cultural capital is by establishing and making known hierarchies of knowledge), ‘replete with cues about what to look at, what information to consider’ (Edensor, 2001: 73), a ‘kind of master script for tourists which reduces disorientation and guides action’ (Edensor, 2001: 70). In addition to print, Hebdige (1979) recognises the power of films and television to organise, interpret experience; much of what we relate to backpacking, ‘already being subjected to a certain amount of prior handling by the media’, the ‘spectacles through which people perceive and evaluate their lives, hopes, setbacks and present situations are made up of the prisms of possible lives’ (Beck, 2000: 54), with literature, television, and the cinema constantly presenting, celebrating or misrepresenting.

As people are bombarded by the global ‘imagination industries’ (Appadurai, 1990), the ‘expansion of the media of communication, not least the development of global TV, and of other new technologies of rapid communication and travel, has made people all over the world more conscious of other places and of the world as a whole’ (Robertson, 1992: 184). As much as television intensified support of the Beats with shows like ‘The Beat Generation’ (1959), ‘The Subterraneans’ (1960) and ‘Route 66’ (1960-1964) led to thousands of individuals taking cross-country road trips in the search for ‘freedom, adventure, escape, discovery and community’ (Packer, 2008: 89), the media also initially popularised the hippies, carrying their message forward, but like the Beats ‘sometimes suggestively, sometimes foolishly and pathetically’ (Lawlor, 2005: 61). Bell (1976: 54) [speaking of the hippies) writes: ‘the life-style once practiced by a small cenacle … is now copied by many … [and] this change of scale gave the culture of the 1960’s its special surge, coupled with the fact that a bohemian life-style once limited to a tiny elite is now acted out on the giant screen of the mass media’.

96 However, by the early 1970’s, the media began to taint this world, reconstructing them as ‘folk devils’, a change keenly felt by drifters in India after ‘Hare rama hare krishna’ (1971) was released. A popular movie in India, its plot saw a brother seek to rescue his sister who had fallen in with drug-addled hippies in Kathmandu (Nepal).
When this world returned in the 1980’s, so did books and movies\(^97\) that fueled the imagination, building dreams and desires (often converted into motivations) as access to images and information representing this world became widespread. From books to movies, the media is now flush with ‘backpacking’ related images, films, fiction, oral histories, documentaries, reality television shows and soap operas\(^98\) (which are primarily produced in the west) and characterise the scapes as white, English speaking, its inhabitants straight, middle-class, able bodied and attractive. Books such as ‘The Beach’ (Alex Garland, 1998), ‘Are you experienced’ (William Sutcliffe, 1997), ‘Gringo Trail’ (Mark Mann, 1999), ‘Go’ (Simon Lewis, 1999), ‘The Backpacker’ (John Harris, 2001), ‘Backpack’ (Emily Barr, 2001), ‘Murder on the Gringo Trail’ (Avram Mednick, 2003), ‘Losing Gemma’ (Katy Gardner, 2003) and ‘Magic Bus: On the Hippie Trail from Istanbul to India’ (Rory McLean, 2008) have joined ‘Backpacker’ films like ‘Brokedown Palace’ (1999), ‘The Beach’ (2000), ‘Eurotrip’ (2004), ‘Wolf Creek’ (2005), ‘Big River’ (2006), ‘Turistas’ (2006), ‘Gone’ (2006), ‘Hostel’ (2006), ‘Hostel 2’ (2007), ‘The Art of Travel’ (2008), ‘The Shrine’ (2009), ‘Hippie Hippie Shake’ (2010) and ‘The Reef’ (2011); reality television shows like ‘Paradise or Bust’ (2008) and ‘Backpackers’ (2006) and documentaries such as ‘Behaviors of the Backpacker’ (2005); ‘A Map for Saturday’ (2008), ‘The Human Experience’ (2008), ‘Hippie Masala’ (2006) and ‘Last Hippie Standing’ (2002). Joining these movies, book and television shows are representations and images produced by backpackers themselves who relay a ‘picture’ of their own lives, ‘contained’ or ‘framed’ by backpacker discourse (blog posts, posting pictures, sending postcards, emails, telegrams, letters, instant messages and texts). When coupled together, a ‘social totality composed of all these separate and fragmented pieces can be coherently grasped’ (Hall, 1977), creating a circle of orientation\(^100\) (Palmowski, 2002) as the scapes are ‘echoed’ through the mediascapes.

### 5.4.1 Writing the Landscape: Producing the Other.

Guidebooks remain a core medium, writing over the landscape and positioning the other, proving a spatial and symbolic framework that means individuals can ‘read’ the scapes, making them legible, not only acting as a ‘pathfinder’ (Cohen, 1995) by aiding in way-finding, but also organising the scapes into coherent patterns by advising, instructing and

---

\(^97\) Given the ‘authentically sincere’ ways individuals adopt the role identity, many movies, book and television shows have backpacker characters. Lefebvre (1991b: 16-17) argues such people are ‘not acting, and this is why actors are able to impersonate them completely. The audience can identify with well-defined ‘beings’ and ‘natures’.

\(^98\) While made by a western countercultural imagination, as media representations spread, larger numbers of people from developing countries (China, Brazil, India) are attracted to this world.


\(^100\) Jenkins (2003) in a study of backpackers to Australia found backpackers were complicit actors in a ‘circle of representation’, as key ‘texts’ were used to ‘represent’ the world were reproduced.
pointing out places of interest, helping individuals to read themselves into an objectively
given world in terms that are coherent, informed and contained (Bold, 1999). While fiction,
television and movies might aid motivational development, guidebooks are a key discursive
element, intensifying consumption and filling the scapes with narrative potential, providing
‘maps of meaning’ (Hall, 1980) and ‘interactional mediation’ (Bhattacharyya, 1997); into
which the scapes are classified. They provide a reductive picture of the scapes by
identifying sites are worth visiting and presenting them with a geographical order.
Reflecting fragments of the scapes logic, they draw out connections between places and by
according status and providing legibility, translating ‘the strangeness of a foreign culture
into a cultural idiom familiar to the visitors’ (Cohen, 1985: 15). The authenticating powers of
Lonely Planet remain influential for western independent travellers and have culturally
familiar to a whole generation of western travellers (Hottola, 1999; Newlands, 2004). Often
referred to as ‘the Bible’; its influence can make or break not just businesses but cities,
districts and even countries by folding them in and out of the scapes, its reductive detail of
the scapes determining the available volume and amount of potential (sub)cultural capital.
By selecting aspects of social, cultural and political life and helping to bring particular
towns, countries, sites, peoples, businesses into the game by objectifying them with
capital, it lays dormant for backpackers until its meanings are unlocked by the narratives
and maps inscribed in these guidebooks. Acting as ‘representational realms’ (Crang, 2006),
in ‘writing the earth’ (Crang, 2004: 76), each new LP publication variously offends and
delights private business, councils and tourist boards as they feed off cultural, social,
political and economic differences. They also sell a ‘commodified relation to the [cultural]
other’ (Frow, 1991: 50) by using its authoritative voice to mediate between the traveller and
the destination as well as between the traveller and the host, their representations and
scripting of the Other as exotic, rooted, bounded and authentic meaning the reader ‘is likely
to feel that his/her own evaluation is unnecessary’ (Bhattacharyya, 1997: 376).

5.5 The Scapes and the logic of the Field.

The scapes draw on a countercultural imagination which supports and legitimises a mobility
that conceals powerful ideologies that are loaded with socially produced meaning,
meanings linked to a destabilisation of existing routines and an answer to individual needs
and desires. As individuals make an imaginative investment in this world, they are aware

101 Swartz (1999) explored how Jack Kerouac’s book ‘On the Road’ (1957) was seen as the ‘Beat Bible’.
102 This could be referred to as symbolic violence—that is, the imposition of structures that perpetuate and legitimate social inequalities
whereby the arbitrariness of the social order is masked and the consent of those who suffer subordination is ensured if not guaranteed.
and accept this world’s potentiality, its regularities and value of the stakes (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Their mobility then is never unfettered, but striated by a ‘whole series of rules, conventions and institutions of regulation and control’ (Amin and Thrift, 2002: 26), ‘connotative codes’ (Hall, 1977), ‘global framing’ (Tarrow, 2005), ‘conventions of performance’ (Adler, 1989: 1378), ‘formulae’ (Berger and Luckmann, 1966) and ‘protocols of engagement’ (Crouch, 2004) that act as social recipes, values and norms. Each social field operates to a different logic, and like different games, one requires the desire, belief, skill and competence to play.

Each field is ‘a relational configuration endowed with a specific gravity’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 17) in the form of rules, norms, ethos and regularities that define its functioning, making possible a shared sense of legitimacy and setting up a reflexive framework for participation. It is a subjectivity that must be worked on constantly when situated within the specific logic of the scapes, where individuals can dramatise ‘their allegiance to places and kinds of action’ (Edensor, 2001), an ideological illusion, where the player needs ‘to participate, to admit that the game is worth playing and that the stakes that are created in and through this fact are worth pursuing’ (Bourdieu, 1998: 77). It involves, a ‘belief in the game’ or illusio which is, at the same time, a precondition for the existence of that ‘game’ (Crossley, 1999: 649-50). These values or stakes are accumulated as (sub)cultural capital, reflecting each individuals position in the scapes as each individual will play to increase or preserve their capital according to the game’s logic. This logic emerged through the alternative value and sign system of drifters, their ‘unusual, irregular or innovative counter-measures to achieve mobility’, desire to be autonomous and to experience transformation, risk and adventure (Cavallo, 2001) emerging as a distinct social world / field. Both ‘a symptom and an expression of a broader alienative forces current among contemporary youth’ (Cohen, 1973: 94), they achieved a working consensus about appropriate and inappropriate enactions.

Despite each individual ‘doing their own thing’ and having a subjective consciousness, a logic developed which began to shape them as much as they shaped it. Even if they could not fully verbalise them, since they are not fully owned by the person doing them (Bauman, 2001; Urry, 2007), those adopting the worlds logic did so voluntary and were not forced upon individuals, their tacit acceptance of the norms and ethos of the game, becoming preset and prescribed over time. By implicitly and explicitly accepting this world’s existence, individuals are offered and accept an alternative range of ideological discourses that entails
a tacit acceptance of its goals, values and truths. This illusio manifested itself in practices that were anti-authoritarian and involved minimal expenditure, the desire to meet locals, the exclusive use of cheap transport or hitchhiking and the search for (spiritual, sexual and narcotic) experiences and encounters (Neville, 1970; Westerhausen, 2002; Van Egmond, 2007). While drifters might have been a product of affluent society, this world represented a reaction to it, characterised by ‘novelty, spontaneity, risk, independence, and a multitude of options’ (Vogt, 1976: 27), a logic made to cohere as a ‘whole way of life’ (Hebdige, 1979).

While there were no set mechanisms for defining membership and regulating activity, the fields logic and performative conventions were informed, contested and directed by radical media, visitor books, face-to-face contact and word of mouth, values that soon took narrative form in the underground press and novels like ‘Power Play’ (1970) by Richard Neville. Invoking ‘a world of pleasure unrelated to productivity, of expressivity divorced from work roles’, these values represented a rebellion against their own culture, the fields logic ‘necessarily structured by a set of unspoken rules for what can be validly uttered or perceived within it’ (Eagleton, 1991: 157), ‘never be adequately expressed in the form of explicit doctrines because of its unlimited and indefinite nature’ (Taylor, 2004: 25). When this world was partially closed down in the 1970’s, it remained a fantasy world for an ‘authentic’ life (Riley, 1988; O’Reilly, 2006; Uriely et al, 2002) until it emerged again in the 1980’s. For academics who sought again to verbalise these ‘badges of honour’ (Bradt, 1995), they argue backpackers travel on a low budget to meet different people, to be (or to feel) free, to be independent and open-minded and to organise one’s journey individually and independently while travelling as long as possible. Pearce (1990) noted the preference for budget accommodation, an emphasis on meeting other travellers, an independently organised and flexible travel schedule, longer rather than very brief holidays and an emphasis on informal and participatory holiday activities.

While I argue the ‘alternative’ guidebook have became more than the ‘unremarkable, representational form, rarely, if ever, celebrated for its literary worth’ (Gilbert and Henderson, 2002: 122), it also sustained the scapes logic by valuing the staging’s that reflected ‘particular codes of behavior and cultural practices, and modes of performance’ (Ateljevic and Doorne, 2004: 295), informing an understanding of what is meant be a part of this imagined world (community). Becoming ‘the main carriers of much of the magic formulas of travelling’, informing the ‘when, where, how and who of backpacking’ (Elsrud, 2004: 206), their availability, low price and portability provided new affordances, although in
an increasingly touristic centred narrative. Oral traditions were transcribed, written down for tangible evidence, providing individuals with the intrinsic knowledge base to know what to look for when attempting to identify the unmarked and authentic, stabilising cultural memory of places and connections between places (Tilley, 1994).

Specific guidebooks like the Lonely Planet (LP), comprised of discursive signifiers came to be signified as accurately representing the scapes. It aided individuals in negotiating this world by arming itself ‘principally with the socially produced tools of discourse’ (Moore, 2002: 58), which led individuals to self-identify as insiders, unifying its readers by infusing the text with meaning. They retain an ideological framing by giving implicit / explicit support to this world, a ritual purchase that helps individuals enter and traverse the scapes, not through ‘rules’ but through ‘instrumental leadership’ (Bhattacharya, 1997). Just as Barthes (1973: 76) noted how the ideological charge of the Blue Guide (Guide bleu) to Spain lend implicit support to Franco’s regime by ‘reducing geography to the description of an uninhabited world of monuments’ (Barthes, 1973: 76), Koshar (2000) notes how guidebooks in Germany from 1933 onwards were encoded with Nazi ideologies turning ‘tourist topographies inside out, replacing older histories and narratives with new ones based on the memory and intentions of a winner-take-all struggle against Communists, Jews, Social Democrats, liberals, and many others’ (Koshar, 2000). Bold (1999: 3) notes the power of the WPA (Works Progress Administration) American Guide Series of America, a series of four hundred guidebooks published in America in the 1930s and 1940s by the FDR (Roosevelt) administration as part of the New Deal. The Federal Writers Project wrote 400 guidebooks for every state, most regions, and many cities, towns, and villages across the United States, promoting not only internal tourism but also ‘social propaganda’ as they assumed the role of conceptualising the national identity, even though the image of America that the guides fostered was closer to fabrication than actuality. The LP (especially their ‘Shoestring’ and ‘On the cheap’ series) are most closely associated with backpacking, bringing its readers into ‘particularly applied relationships with the worlds ideological template, conferring the illusion of individual autonomy and control connecting its fundamental truths to specific places, sites and sights. Literary theorist, Edward Said (1978: 93) says ‘people, places, and experiences can always be described by a book so much that the book acquires greater authority, and use, even than the actuality it describes’; and has remained a ‘serious artifact of modern culture, and a symbol of desire for emancipatory meaning’ (Koshar, 2000: 212).
For critics, the alternative guidebook is seen as a ‘linguistic agents of touristic social control’ (Dann, 1999: 163), as they come to be published through normal business practices, their ideological framing now diminished as publishers meet the demands for short haul visits and middle class concerns. As Maureen Wheeler (co-founder of Lonely Planet) explains, ‘When we were selling five thousand Japanese guidebooks a year, who cared what we said? At fifty thousand, you have a different responsibility’ (cited in Lislie, 2008), its iconoclastic tone muted as self-censorship and political pressure by countries who disliked over realistic information (prostitution, homosexuality, drugs), any controversial type of information – such as ‘the merits of Kashmiri and Afghan marijuana’ (Butcher, 2003: 41) now pruned and eliminated. Rather than reflect the scapes, they are increasingly gentrifying them, mobilised with popular tourism imagery. According to a LP author named Sara Benson (in Friend, 2005), ‘Our Hawaii book used to be written for people who were picking their own guava and sneaking into the resort pool, and we were getting killed by the competition. So we relaunched it for a more typical two-week American mid-market vacation. That sold, but it didn’t feel very Lonely Planet’. For critics, guidebooks fall short, ‘its failure is a function of the social contradiction that produced it in the first place, and of the limitations of all too many users’ (Koshar, 2000: 212), its symbolic power in categorising events, activities, products and services, criticised as spawning generations of ‘mass backpackers’ (Butcher, 2003: 45); the Shoestring series aimed at backpackers now only making up only three per cent of the company’s sales (Friend, 2005).

However, guidebook power is over-stated and even the LP does not make ‘backpacking happen’ and could not force a wholesale revision of normative expectations of this world, and while they provide backpackers with clear ideas about what to expect, what to do and how to act, symbolic power and words alone cannot create individual desire, belief and an active sense of identity. While it may have some ‘lessons’ about how to act and be in this world, the scapes are a semi-autonomous field with its own regulative principles that demand certain responses by ‘hailing’ the individual to respond to themselves and their surroundings in specific ways (Adams, 2006). While the guidebook can represent imagined worlds from which their readers derive ‘meaning and ideological orientation’ (Koshar, 2000: 9), since their texts are arranged into ‘discourses’ or ‘frameworks that embrace particular combinations of narratives, concepts and ideologies’ (Jenkins, 2003: 306), backpacking is ultimately framed by the body in the social world and the social world in the body. While

103 Their first guidebook produced advice such as ‘in Afghanistan…you can get stoned just taking a deep breath in the streets’ (Wheeler, 1973: 14).
backpackers early in the socialisation process are dependent on guidebooks, initially having no choice but to accept the world provided for them, they cannot wholly account for daily practices and the varied encounters that mobility yields. The scapes are continually ‘negotiated, challenged, manipulated, and upheld or changed through social interaction’ (Sørensen, 2003: 855) as individuals themselves carry out the labour of transforming ‘places into spaces and spaces into places’ (de Certeau, 1988: 118), where positions, postures or position-taking are determined by the amounts of capital available to individuals. Serving as a means to enter this world and a resource for action, this capital is incorporated and embodied into individual’s subjectivity and self-identity, ‘as people recognize themselves and are recognized by others as subjects/agents’ (Holt, 2008: 238). However, its accumulation depends on dispositions that must be learned and internalised so as to constitute a ‘discrete concretization of cultural assumptions’ (Carlson, 1996: 16), reinforcing social and cultural norms about what to do when one is in the scapes, dispositions that construct the meaningful orderliness of social situations (Garfinkel, 1967). It means learning to read and play the game within the boundaries of the scapes, boundaries not set by guidebooks but established by ‘people together tackling the world around them with familiar maneuvers’ (Frykman and Löfgren 1996: 10-11), learning new elements by encountering the scapes in a particular way, as over time, individuals gain the skills, specific competencies and (sub)cultural knowledge to ‘read’ the scapes and behave according to its logic without reference to guidebooks.

5.6 Producing the Scapes.

Moving past imagination and representation, backpacker lived practices entail physical movement on routes between specific places and sites that are stages for capital accumulation and diverse performances and experiences, mobility not reducing the significance of place but changing them; ‘the value of places and capital twisting and swirling around, changing the fixing of place, as places are excluded and fall out of fashion while new places are brought into play’ (Urry, 2006: vii). Incorporated within ‘the economy of taste’ (Coleman and Crang, 1997: 9), specific (practical and symbolic) events, landmarks, nodes, systems, spaces, enclaves, sights, peoples, events come to be invested with meanings that express the particular values of the field. From ‘locative’ or stationary features (building, monuments, geographic features – rivers, mountains) to ‘itinerant’ features, which refer to the unstable, ephemeral dimensions of place that highlight mobility, movement and contingency (Bremer, 2004), the scapes enfold various places. Aspects of
place need to be seen ‘for oneself’, to be experienced directly (Urry, 2002), involving issues of transportation and movement between them, which is also part of the ‘performed art’ of backpacking, the journey between the dots, that is, the strategies and tactics the traveller has to employ in order to get from one place to another. Rather than mere backdrop to backpacker practices and performances, ‘free-spaces’ or ‘blank environmental slates’ ‘on which perception and cognition sets to work’ (Tilley, 1994), places travelled to depend in part upon what is practiced within them (Gogia, 2006), places that rather than stand alone or fixed, are implicated within wider networks of mobility, the various paths ‘that enable embodied and material performances to occur’ (Urry, 2004: 29). Without these places of affect, the scapes would not exist given it is the anticipation of encounters and connections with these places that make movement through them desired and appropriate; ‘no paths without places and vice versa to cobstitute destinations and departures’ (Spinney, 2007: 26). These places shape the scapes, each encounter leaving their mark on the backpacker, having resonance when viewed with particular mindsets that makes them complicit in movement, each place with its ‘respective altitudes, languages, cuisines, climates, physical challenges and health risks’ (Germann-Molz, 2006a: 6) becoming part of the individual experience. They are a school of seeing, ‘they have effects on the habitus, even on the physiognomy of those who habitually move about within them’ which ‘can't fail to have an impact on the senses of the subject’ (Misik, 2006). Places are in ‘play’ and can be seen as ‘stretching in, through and under any apparently distinct locality’ (Bærenholdt et al, 2004: 145), partly constituted through backpackers lived practices, as they move through space. Rather than existing a priori or wholly encompassing representational layer covering real places and peoples, the scapes depend on places that have emerged or been appropriated within complex networks by which ‘hosts, guests, buildings, objects and machines’ (Hannam et al, 2006: 13) are contingently brought together to offer a stage so that backpackers can perform a particular relation to their world. Never static, and existing as long as they are assembled, created, distributed, maintained, circulated and traded around the globe in guidebooks, bars and hostels as well as online, the depth, spread and durability of the scapes is now global, incorporating thousands of places, which are organised within networks of mobility (NOM).

5.6.1 Networks of Mobility (NOM).

As backpackers ‘weave patterns in the landscape’ they draw ‘some places together, pushing others apart’ (Murdock, 2006: 97), Roget (1857: 73; original emphasis) noting that
'[a] thing cannot be said to move from one place to another, unless it passes in succession through every intermediate place; hence motion is only such a change of place as is successive'. Rather than think of backpacking in terms of destinations, their world is structured by their practice of networks of mobility (NOM) that link up places and people set aside for specific practices and performances. These ‘circuits of movement’ (Tuan, 1977), rather than locked together due to the ‘outcome of a random spatial lottery’ (Williams and Hall, 2002: 2) or followed slavishly as an itinerary are linked because of social, economic, culture, geographic, ritual, symbolic and practical significance (historically based on culture, trade, religion, caste) and have existed since medieval times by serving as links between people and places. From the slave and post-slave trade to legal and illegal migration, ‘structured travel circuits’ (Clifford, 1997) organise imagined worlds without been dominated by one particular node. Williams (1988) argues we need to be ‘fascinated by the networks men and women set up, the trails and territorial structures they make as they move across a region, and the ways these interact or interfere with each other’. While the first modernity was characterised by tracks, roads, asphalt and tar, railway lines, hub airports and ports, etched onto the ground, ‘by air corridors, by frequencies, by maps, by itineraries’ (Thrift, 1996: 304), the second modernity is characterised by routes established by the way they are represented as constitute of what Hall (2008: 19) calls ‘the socio-economic path space of a particular type of lifestyle mobility’. While many of these routes are shadow or ‘dark networks’ inhabited by migrants, the disabled, terrorists, trafficked women, the sick and the homeless, all networks, Mol and Law (1994: 649) argue contain ‘[p]laces with a similar set of elements and similar relations between them are close to one another, and those with different elements or relations are far apart’.

These networks are never hermetically designed into precise and final detail, but are mobile, active, bodily lived and symbolically embodied, guiding activity ‘[in] the immediate as well as the symbolic sense, in the physical as well as the intellectual sense’ (Simmel, 1997: 171). Like other worlds produced through the ‘touristic’ desire, they are not structured by roads but routes (wine routes to self-drive motoring routes), which might include multiple attractions, towns, natural sites, and interpretive centres, but are not reducible to an

---

104 Many mobile groupings manage their mobility through a variety of avoidance techniques, such the disabled, the homeless or HIV sufferers (Imrie, 2000; May, 2000; le Marcis, 2004). Le Marcis notes how due to the AIDS stigma, those with the illness create spaces-times where their polluting bodies aren’t an issue (eating together in particular restaurants, going to particular church servicers, creating their own sports clubs), but those suffering from full blown AIDS, despite ill health – are moved in an every expanding networks of clinics, hospitals, support groups and hospices before coming to the rest on their final stop – the graveyard.
aggregate of specific sites, places and sights. Individual places become constructed in
to other places, a ‘network of affiliations, or of debts and borrowings between
places, the nature of travel as a sequence’ (Crang, 2006: 63). Encountering such places in
a means the scapes unfold before the backpacker in a sequential manner and are grasped
through the affordances they offer to them, becoming mutual elements amongst
backpackers. A NOM incorporates particular spaces and places, surrounded by time-space
walls on all sides, providing for ‘tunnel effects’ where spaces and places are brought closer
together, ‘while pushing physically adjacent areas further away’ (Van der Duim, 2007a:
157). These NOM are not necessarily the shortest route across a territory or state, or
between the arriving and departing airports, but are routes, which are significant for
personal and cultural identities, as well as providing encounters, connections, movements,
exchanges, interrelationships, proximities, socialites and experiences. They mark and
demarcate space as distinctive and meaningful, producing a sense of ownership for those
who journey through them. Backpacker practices suggest a clear mental map of routes
counters disorientation, offering the anticipation that a journey can be made while serving
as a collective basis for identity. From the Banana Pancake Trail (South East Asia), The
Garden Route (Southern Africa) to The Gringo Trail (Central and South America), ‘[w]hole
regions have become travel circuits (in popular travel discourse, ‘doing’ South East Asia,
Central America, and so on), and the world exists as something ‘to go around’ (Munt, 1994:
114; original emphasis). Unfolding experiences that come together in and through
particular pathways and particular places, their identification and performance help
individuals to become socialised to this world. There is an attraction of doing the same
things and being in the same places with those they feel affiliation with, a practice of
identification evidence of agency, giving individuals the elective and expressive identity that
they seek (Hetherington, 1998), while insulating them from ‘the perils of solitary travel: the
loneliness of the lonely planet’ (Allon, 2004: 50). As the number of routes that make up the
scapes grow, more places are drawn into a global network of imaginative geographies,
socially constructed ‘trail myths’ and ‘place myths’ reinforced through mobility practices and
representations, ‘the opening of a space of places at which activities can intelligibly be
performed’ (Schatzki, 1996: 115) providing an important sense of place and emotional and
ontological security.

These routes are well known, even before a trip is made, guidebooks like the LP a powerful
bearer of carefully constructed, coded and weighted pathways, inscribing them in detail at
the start of each of their guidebooks, translating the spatial order through maps and
temporal sequences, ‘defining proximity and distance in terms of time and feasibility’ (Adler, 1989: 1369) and ‘the chances of success for practices’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 242). These route maps offer ontological security that backpackers are ‘in’ these mapped spaces, accumulating the right capital by offering directions, assuring them they are where they are supposed to be, paths constituting poignant meeting points, representing as well as facilitating their relation and belonging to the world. These networks allow the backpacker ‘grapevine’ (Murphy, 2001) to operate, where information and tales are exchanged amongst backpackers, reinforcing the popularity of certain routes and must see or practiced sites, favored accommodation and attractions, where movement is talked about, recounted, written about as part of ‘documenting the real’. These narratives fill each network, narratives giving each place significance and meaning, linking them together, each story a ‘discursive articulation of a spatializing practice, a bodily itinerary and routine’ (Tilley, 1994: 32), ‘simultaneously producing geographies of actions and drifting into the commonplaces of an order’, organising movement so as to ‘make the journey, before or during the time the feet perform it’ (de Certeau, 1988: 116). As individuals follow in the footsteps of others, bound by a common motion and purpose, some routes temporally attain a ‘structured coherence’ (Harvey, 1985), attaining mythical status or buzz and become ‘worn and grooved’ (Cresswell, 2003) as they augment and enable movement through a profusion of symbolic places that have risen in significance. However, because there are always forces of disruption at play it might be more appropriate to speak of a tendency towards structured coherence within a totality of productive forces and social relations. Their popularity is dependent on symbolic spaces being produced and available to realise particular performances of specific places, with some routes falling out of favor but others attracting material investment that provides direction, moorings, fixity and profit. While coherence is never complete; popular networks are increasingly anchored by material investment that can impact of how individuals transcend space and time, where such infrastructure is fixed in space (Graham and Marvin, 2001: 191-92), a coherence has seen key nodes along these scapes cleaned up and repackaged for for more mainstream international tourism.

5.6.2 The Hippie Trail.

One of the most famous and emblematic routes was the ‘Hippie Trail’ or ‘Hashish Trail’ (Time, 1967\(^{105}\)) which passed through ‘key’ spots and staging’s such as Istanbul, Tehran,

\(^{105}\) http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,899555-1,00.html
and Kabul, Goa and Kathmandu with less popular extensions to Thailand, Bali and Japan. Acting to fuse time and space, the trail created paths with a degree of ‘structured homology’. Holding out the possibility for counter hegemonic spatial and non-spatial practices together with alternative ways of visualising space and society, the trail structured the drift east, becoming a flow of the mind as well as the body, identified by many of those who took it ‘as the pivotal moment, when the possibility of a kind of change, of something different, was glimpsed, when energy, a good time and some sort of community became woven together’ (McKay, 1996: 45-46). Mitchell (1996) argues that for space to be emblematic it needs to be made seen as immutable, made into landscapes that ‘we live in, pass through, and respond to, and in this way the landscape defines us…an externalized shaper of human emotion and action’ (Mitchell, 1996: 23). By the late 1960’s the drift east was more than a means of getting from one place to another, as the trail was gradually formed, ordering places, events, accommodations, transport and relationships. While not structured as a roadway, it suggested ‘a complex relationality of places and peoples that are connected through diverse performances’ (Bærenholdt et al, 2004: 150); staging’s not separate from the places, cultures and people that happened to be traversed. The drifters spatial logic favored movement towards, between, through and across particular places that have been elevated in importance and enshrined as ‘sites’ (Bruner, 1991: 114) such as the spirituality of Dharmashala, the cooler climes and house boats of Kashmir, the beaches and hedonism of Goa and the drugs to be found in the Kulu Valley. Each distinct place enabled (and still does) various practices and performances, landscapes ‘composed not only of what lies before our eyes but what lies within our heads’ (Meinig, 1979: 34), the path a cultural act since it followed in the steps inscribed by others, ‘whose steps have worn a conduit for movement which becomes the correct or ‘best way to go’’ (Tilley, 1994: 31). The trail was a template for repeated movements, an assemblage of places, systems and spaces that had to be travelled to, used, seen, talked about and shared - place difference shaping both the origins and the flows of mobility (Williams and Hall, 2002). It was along these nascent routes where bodies could actively take up a form of identification and where messages, gossip, myths, encounters, proximities, solidarities, information, narratives and capital disproportionately flowed, carrying an energy and desire that soon resonated outwards, as circulating people, images and stories spread around the globe, a logic that resonates across books, television screens to this day, as much as it is still felt by those who travelled on it.
5.6.3 Sense of Place.

The scapes are not bounded to a distinct place or event, but are weaved together by bodies along paths, distributed lines and networks, channeling mobility that doesn’t destroy ‘sense of place’, but creates it. Where once it was thought only to derive from a sedentary position, backpackers can become the space to which they have invested their belief and desire, dwelling in movement giving them perpetual and cognitive fixity from which to move on from encounter to encounter and reproduce the dominant meanings from they look out on to the world. As their trip progresses, their practical knowledge, skill and competencies increases, their accumulated capital enabling them to see the scapes as ‘lived space’ (Lefebvre, 1991a) or ‘practiced place’ (de Certeau, 1988: 117), ‘composed of intersections of mobile elements’, ‘actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it’ (ibid, 117). Rather than see each event, person, place in relation to a fixed point of reference such as ‘home’ as ‘tourists’ might (MacCannell, 1976), most narratives, stories, chatter, myths and gossip are about what’s happening in other parts of the network, from the places they’ve being to or places they are travelling to, the ‘importance and significance if a place ... only appreciated as part from movement from and to it in relation to others, and the act of moving may be as important as that of arriving’ (Tilley, 1994: 31). In many ways, I argue what the tourist may seen as extraordinary becomes an ordinary aspect of backpackers own social life, since mobility is experienced in an usual context, their sense of time, space, global and local shaped through mobile practices. As the journey progresses, the difference between ordinary and extraordinary becomes blurred, a sense of place developing as individuals move through networks of mobility, prompting a belonging that propels further movement that lays claim to different, places, people and cultures.

The scapes can be appropriated as transformative, habitable and believable, worlds in which backpackers are in constant contact and engagement. While the scapes may seem overpowering, fragmented and fluid for newcomers, for those who have the time to build up a history of experiences and encounters, their competence in reading the scapes enables them to see it and feel it as a coherent whole, where ‘[w]hat begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value’ (Tuan, 1977: 6). This sense of place, while felt individually will only come about thought a constant stream of encounters, impressions, interactions that can be consumed and conveyed to others, the continual and regular human activity of like-minded others combining in space and time to produce an ‘existential insideness’, described by Tim Cresswell as ‘a feeling of belonging
within the rhythm of life-in-place’ (Cresswell, 2003: 277).

5.7 Chapter Summary.

I argue in this chapter for the concept of travellerscapes, a global social field where individuals with the necessary desire, resources and belief can inhabit an imagined world (community) physically, virtually, imaginatively, corporeally, reflexively and intellectually, acting upon it and being acted upon. While there is no ‘true’ reading of any scape, I argue the hippies and others left the ‘the given world of perception, nature, and common experience temporarily behind and to generate an alternative universe which will provide the field of play, thought, or experiment’ (Berger, 1990: 458; original emphasis), one of a number of possible worlds. The boundaries of this world were both internal and external. Rather than a homogenous space cordoned off by distinct borders, movement was constructed through the act of collective imagination, its collective nature persisting over time so as to be taken as ‘real’. This world was fluid, every changing and always in a process of belonging, produced by the mobility and the interactions of people who inhabited it. A product of social practices and performance and as something constructed by movements of people and by the very ‘use’ of this space, today the backpacker has been represented as its primary inhabitant, geographically dispersed individuals drawn by what these scapes can potentially offer.

However, they do not and can’t recognise, verbalise or define the scapes, even though this world is stabilised and reproduced through their personal desire and action, since the scapes are grounded in individual perception and appreciation. Backpackers learn how to read and grasp the scapes over time, buying into specific representations of particular spaces, routes, rituals and practices which have historic, economic, social, cultural meaning and significance (Hetherington, 1998). I argue that these imaginatively and socially produced scapes can play the same role as ‘home’ for those backpackers who invest meaning in them as they move along routes inscribed by others, ‘whose steps have worn a conduit for movement’ (Tilley, 1994: 31). By inhabiting the scapes and allowing such scapes to envelop you, a sense of place, belonging and a sense of legitimacy can emerge as individuals connect up spatial impressions with temporally inscribed narratives. As something ‘dwelled in’ and moved through, the scapes produce the foundation and basic co-ordinates for individual existence, given them the space for dispositions to emerge and serving as an arena for social differentiation and the expression of identity.
Inhabiting the field like a ‘garment’ (Bourdieu, 2000), interacting with others backpackers in negotiation, collaboration and conflict, I argued that the scapes taken as a whole constitute a ‘field’. Loosely described by Bourdieu as a culturally significant, socially and institutionally constituted arena, characterised by desirable goods, capital and accepted ways of doing things, backpackers act as ‘agents who are socially constituted as active and acting in the field’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 107), constituted into an ‘area of production, endowed with its own logic and its own history’ (Bourdieu, 1978: 820-821). Generated and reproduced through power struggles between institutional or individual actors, who compete for appropriation power and resources, it is described by Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992: 16) as ‘a set of objective, historical relations between positions anchored in certain forms of power (or capital)’. The parameters of the of the scapes (field, game) are set every moment of every day, and while those early in their trip, find their limits set by the guidebook and the world provided for them in mind, they only ‘partly’ control the subject matter and how it comes to be represented (Ling, 2003), since individuals must bodily incorporate the scapes logic as dispositions if they are to play the game correctly, and over time seek to improve their position in it. Structured by (sub)cultural capital which act as stakes that backpackers struggle to attain, individuals become socialised into a world, their body and mind endowed with dispositions that orient them towards the stakes, their ‘yearning for a true self’ (Taussig, 1993: xvii) driving them from place to place and encounter to encounter, since no one place or experience will fulfill them.

I noted in particular the importance of the underground press and the media in general at a particular historical juncture (Appadurai, 1996) as they helped to ignite and sustain the drift east by recording and mapping this new world and along with books, images and letters, inspired and gave a new rationale to travel. In an act of ‘delegation’ (Bourdieu, 1991), ‘alternative’ guidebooks were soon given symbolic power and agency by drifters to evaluate, sanction and thereby legitimise certain cultural forms and practices, entrusted with the expression of the will of this worlds constituents, creating the aesthetic raw material for their readers and turning the scapes into a ‘collective social fact’. Rather than ‘a story-less modern imagination moving from non-place to non-place, and even enjoying the anonymity of highways, airports, large hotels and shopping malls’ (Hartman, 1999:421), this world was full of social, political, cultural and economic value. By turning this world into words and maps, they replaced what had previously been written on notice boards and visitor’s books and became a vital ingredient for individuals to forge claims to subjectivity.
Recording a world, which was ‘progressively sculpted, invalidated, verified, detailed’ (de Certeau, 1988: 169), they have become arbiters of what is ‘proper’, offering ideological contingency by valuing particular practices, bodies, events and practices, enabling backpackers to collect the ‘right’ kinds of places and experiences, their symbolic power creating common currency, history and experiential frames that sustains relevant frames of self-identification and collective action. Initially consolidating an individual's entry into this world, they continually scan the world for places, sites and people, proving to be a necessary component in backpacking. However, as representational realms, they are merely a part of the scapes, joining postcards, images, podcasts, letters, emails, and blogs entries, books that circulate within and outside the scapes to offer symbolic clues for subjective reinvention, the being and doing of backpacking determined by backpackers themselves and the ‘impulses that push toward a self-investment in the object’ (Bourdieu, 1999: 512).

The media were not the legislators of the world, but drawing on the countercultural imagination, their worlds, stories and pictures provided individuals with clues to the shape, boundaries and meaning of the world they inhabited and their place in it. Narrated and represented in literature, art, film, and theatre, creativity was dependent upon mobility; the words of those who took the same journey east and submitted their own words taking on symbolic resonance. Today, Interaction and continuous contestation sustain the scapes significance, creating scholarly research as well as representations of backpacker mobilities in literature, media, documentary, cinema and fiction. While alternative guidebooks cannot be used diffidently to dominant ideological expectations, they can help to conceive a new way of life, providing the raw material to think of different ways of life and different paths. Codes and conventions are partially scripted, knowledge acquired from various sources and influences which give them a stock of knowledge, desire and motivation to interact in this world, enabling them to enter this world and interact at different times and in different places as functioning members, with varying degrees of belonging. Behind the term, the travellerspaces hide a plurality of places: rural and urban, spectacular and overlooked, everyday and enchanting, remembered and contested, protected and degraded, embodied, enacted, looked at, moved through, worked on and lived in. This life-world where mobilities helps produce and re-produce norms, meanings and durable dispositions amongst travellers who oriented and seek belonging to this world, the imagination still working on a collective basis, taking place through a wide range of daily practices, through which the scapes emerge. However, as routes become more coherent,
and the market value placed on unsettled bodies, the scapes can be impinged upon by institutions, intermediaries and governments who recognise that individuals belong to this world (imagined world) and unite with others (community), where specific practice are constitutive of their own identities.
Chapter Six: Mobility Systems and Spaces of Consumption.
6.1 Introduction.

Individuals allow the scapes to envelop them, positioning themselves so that it surrounds them mentally and bodily, its opportunities, affirmations, possibilities, exclusions and constrains offering ground for self-induced mobility, creating a distinct flow along paths that facilitate movement and are an expression of that movement. While I have argued we need to understand backpacking through the encounters their mobility yields; this chapter argues such mobility is linked to contextual objects, machines, texts, systems, physical meeting places and infrastructure. The ethnomethodological (EM) approach notes those systems and self-organising social settings from which agency may arise, ‘to make its properties as an organized environment of practical activities detectable, countable, recordable, reportable, tell-a-story-aboutable, short, accountable’ (Garfinkel, 1967/1984: 33; original emphasis). This demands an analysis of the settings, systems, fixities, moorings, spaces, hubs, nodes and networks that enable member movement and interplay. While terms such as ‘travel’, ‘mobility’, ‘displacement’, ‘frontier’, ‘transience’, ‘dislocation’, ‘fluidity’ and ‘permeability’ are central to thinking about the nature of backpackers subjectivity (in progress) and the formation of a (personal and social) identity, Janet Wolff (1993: 235) has observed that ‘[t]he problem with terms like ‘nomad’, ‘maps’ and ‘travel’ is that they are not usually located, and hence (and purposely) they suggest ungrounded and unbounded movement - since the whole point is to resist fixed selves/viewers/subjects’. However, as the scapes act upon individuals (and vice-versa), this chapter argues backpacking is ‘taking place’ (Sørensen, 2003: 864) through systems, machines and spaces that link their world together in specific ways, enabling a huge amount of physical travel as well as the circulation of ideas, capital and knowledge.

The bricolage has great latitude in selecting the member settings which to explore with ‘any circumstance, situation or activity which participants treat as one in which instruction-and-learning is occurring investigated for how instruction and learning can be produced by and among participants’ (Koschmann et al, 2004: 281). The criteria by which site selection is done has to do with the situated character of activities within given structures, where structures of action are produced and managed (Hester and Francis, 2007). As a bricoleur, I am aware of how backpackers are located, and must depict the scapes in a sometimes fragmented and unconventional way, since there there are many ways of seeing this world, many possible ways of mapping it. However, rather than abolish meaning, I plot a trajectory of infrastructures, mobility systems, social spaces that operate within the scapes that have
meaning for backpackers, sewing them to together necessary for any interpretation of the
scapes. Firstly, this chapter explores the importance of mobility systems and technologies
of mobility such as transport, as these systems distribute backpackers through time-space.
Secondly, the chapter takes examines the phenomena of ‘backpacker hostels’; the network
of backpacker oriented accommodations that are historically, discursively, symbolically and
materially are part of backpackers’ imaginary and lived geographies. I will argue that the
concept of the ‘backpacker hostel’ has risen symbolically and materially to become a
validated and sanctioned portal for entry into this world; an important infrastructure and a
key building block through which people relate to and associate with backpacking. While
backpacker movement is not fully determined by hostels, and is part of the wider budget
infrastructural geographies of backpacking, they play a major part within the system of
interrelated institutions (transport, communications, roads, airlines), which support their
mobility, becoming a symbol of backpacker travel itself. Celebrated and represented in film,
media and literature as the antithesis to the 'International hotel' and as the primary
time/space experiential setting where individuals perform, narrate stories, sample (or build)
an identity, exchange knowledge and information over geographical space, it also allows
movement through that space. Practiced and performed as a key system of provision, like
Clifford’s (1992: 105; original emphasis) hotel, they ‘epitomizes a specific way into complex
histories of travelling cultures (and cultures of travel)’, the hostel working as a research tool
for interpretation since it represents the moving and provisional nature of backpacking,
allowing us to look to the past and recollect traces and vestiges in its development. Finally,
this chapter investigates how backpacking materialises along the networks of mobility in
the social and cross-cultural space called ‘backpacker enclaves’, where discourses,
practices and institutions come together to make backpacking a very visible reality.

This chapter draws heavily from my own performance and the performance of others, since
the chapter drive from data from those moments of pause, along the networked scapes,
their some very accessibility and use central to the practice and performance of
backpacking. Entering these settings was not a difficulty for me, and I did not have to
spend time seeking settings out or spend time making contacts, insights gained from being
part of the ‘lived experience’, insider knowledge giving ‘a feel for the game and the hidden
rules’ (Bourdieu, 1988: 27). It should be noted that my ‘insider’ position did not put any
undue pressure on participants to take part, respond or perform in particular ways. It should
also be noted that I stayed in over 120 properties during my research, staying in those
recommended in backpacker guidebooks, websites but primarily because of
recommendations of other travellers. While some of these were booked via hostelworld.com\textsuperscript{106}, some were through walk-in requests. I also moved through, dwelled and communicated with backpackers in various backpacker enclaves during my field research. The main enclaves were in Huaraz (Peru), Cusco (Peru), Sagarnaga Street (La Paz, Bolivia), Yangshuo (China), Yangren Foreigner Street (Dali, China), Paharganj (Delhi, India), Mcleo Ganj (India), Manali (India), Ko Shan Road (Bangkok, Thailand), Old Quarter (Hanoi, Vietnam) and the Pham Ngu Lao Area (Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam).


The scapes, imagined and lived landscapes of mobility and practice circulates more than just bodies, but also texts, technologies, ideas, information, capital, services, labour, commodities objects and dangers at various spatial ranges and speeds, without which backpacking would not happen. ‘Being-in-the-world’ is not ‘independent of the technological, physical, social, and economic environment in which that body has its being’ (Harvey, 2000: 98). Law (1994: 24; original emphasis) asserts if ‘left to their own devices human actions and words do not spread very far at all’ and while backpackers might be in ‘control’ of their self-induced mobility, their socially constructed mobility requires them to rest heavily on infrastructure, fixed systems, objects and social spaces. The scapes are an heterogeneous assemblage that ultimately constructs networks, involving ‘transport’, (air, sea, land, rail, wire), exceptionally ‘immobile platforms’ fixed in place (Larsen et al, 2006; Urry, 2007) such as ATM machines, banks, transmitters, roads, railways, telephone lines, airports, docks; ‘service providers’ such as shops, money changers, banks as well as more ‘submerged systems’, things and objects such as machines, timetables, passports, visas, credit cards, wires, vaccinations, cables, cameras, phones and ‘networks’ that carry phone or fax messages, information, pictures and images, money and computer information (Franklin, 2004; Ek and Hultman, 2008; Urry, 2007; van der Duim, 2007a, b). There is a continual tension between ‘fixity’ and ‘need for motion’, between immutability and mobility, a friction without which mobility and the linkages between multiple spaces and times would not happen. The above systems, objects and networks enable the ‘fluidities of liquid modernity’ with no ‘linear increase in fluidity without extensive systems of immobility’ (Urry, 2008: 18). As much as the scapes envelop individuals, various systems, technologies and spaces also become ‘wrapped in and wrapped around people’s lives’ (Thrift, 1990: 453).

\textsuperscript{106} Paris (2009: 33) argues that ‘the ease of booking hostels and transportation online, especially through online booking agents like hostelworld.com or hostelbookers.com and Kayak.com, have allowed backpackers to find the best deal by comparing many options, both prior to departure and while on the road’.
From phones for communication, infrastructure for sleeping to systems for travel, objects, systems and spaces contribute to the organisation of mobility and are ‘a pre- eminent condition for facilitating this societal phenomenon’ (Verheyen, 2003: 294).

Products, services, objects, materials, hubs, objects and technologies and organisations provide for motion, tourist performances ‘made possible and pleasurable by objects, machines, and technologies’ (Haldrup and Larsen, 2006: 276), permitting ‘predictable and relatively risk-free repetition of the movement in question’ (Urry, 2007: 13). Tourism mobilities involve ‘material practices that serve to organize and support specific ways of experiencing the world’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001:15) helping tourists navigate around a ‘touristic world’ as tourists while at the same time being navigated by it (Franklin, 2003). Backpacker mobilities fuse together discourses, materiality and practices and are underpinned by transportation, information and communications systems and infrastructure, the possibilities and limitations of the scapes partially determined by their institutional arrangements, mobility related practices relying on institutions, infrastructures and systems which when combined with non-material sites, objects and scenery can structure, define and configure the scapes. Backpacking, inter-subjectively real and social cannot be reduced to the social because it is linked to a ‘patterned networks of heterogeneous materials’ (Law, 1992: 381) which together enable and reproduce backpacking. If one were to take away the planes, hostels, boats, passports, maps, visas, timetables, credit cards, trains, railway stations, ATM machines, banks and internet cafes; ‘time-space decompresses immediately’ (Verschoor, 1997: 42) thereby altering how ‘people appear to experience the modern world, changing both their forms of subjectivity and sociability’ (Lash and Urry, 1994: 256).

6.3 Technologies of Mobility: Transporting the Subject.

It is necessary to analyse the various systems that distribute people through time-space; given that mobility systems are ‘organised around the processes that circulate people, objects and information at various spatial ranges and speeds’ (Urry, 2007: 272). As all mobilities entail ‘specific often highly embedded and immobile infrastructures’ (Sheller and Urry, 2006: 210), tourism is ‘historically made possible by technological developments and vastly increased by them’ (Parrinello, 2001: 214). From the introduction to railway systems to jet airlines, the availability of faster transport results in larger tourist numbers (Palmowski, 2002), the first modern guidebooks appearing in the 1830’s, precisely when
the railways ‘began to envelop these societies, transporting their inhabitants with unexampled speed and efficiency’ (Koshar, 2000: 3). Similarly, Lash and Urry (1994: 254-256) note the transformative impact of the ‘city centre hotels in the late nineteenth century normally located by major railway station’ and the post-war growth of packaged holidays with the emergence of the first passenger jets. The combination of ‘organizational, technical and travel innovations has led to growth in both the volume and spatial reach of tourist flows’ (Hudson, 2005: 94), extending them from the intra-national to the international and intercontinental, with recent research noting the impact of cars, buses, airports, airplanes, taxis and budget airlines on tourism (Adey, 2009; Sheller and Urry, 2006).

Partially ordered through fixed infrastructural moorings and transportation systems, movement cannot be described without taking into account the ‘spatial, infrastructural and institutional moorings that configure and enable mobilities’ (Hamman et al, 2006: 3). For the counterculture, the ways and means of movement became an important and revealed part of their mobility with hitchhiking becoming popular conduit for individual’s to move around and communicate ideas and knowledge (Packer, 2008).

However, once the drift east emerged, individuals required the competence to arrange transport, a haphazard hippie bus schedule emerging to enhance and enable their drift east while others appropriated and adapted second-hand vans, old school buses, panel trucks and Volkswagen microbuses. The journey with others was an overt performance of their belonging and orientation, the emergence of ‘freak’ buses or ‘drifter-orientated’ transportation systems in the late 1960’s transporting large numbers from London and Amsterdam to Istanbul and then onto India and Nepal (while similar services operated from Australia to London) for a fixed price. Companies such as the Magic Bus, Transit Travel, AutoTours, Penn Overland, Sundowners, Top Deck and the Yes Bus facilitated the emergence of early drifting as they brought drifters back and forth along the hippie trail in very visible vehicles on routes that were relatively fixed and bi-directional. These companies were promoted in the underground press at the time, with the Magic Bus booking agency in Amsterdam and Budget Bus, which left from London107 featuring predominantly. As well as the direct route to Delhi, by the early 1970’s, bus companies were offering longer ‘cultural trips’ via Lebanon, Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Nepal, a trip coinciding with drug routes of the time. The airline Icelandair also enabled Americans to join this drift, becoming known as the ‘hippies airline’ (Nelms, 1995) after it featured in a

107 The ‘International Times’ for October 1969 announced the departure of a Budget Bus with reclining seats from London to Delhi for £65.
Time magazine article in 1970\textsuperscript{108}, describing how the ‘large contingent of disheveled hippies’ could make low cost travel journeys from the USA (via a stop in Iceland) to Luxembourg\textsuperscript{109}.

When backpacking re-emerged, these bus companies had folded, but like the drifters, backpackers were soon to benefit from developments in transport, soon adopting ‘backpacker’ buses and vans (Johnson, 2010; Vance, 2004; Wilson et al, 2008) and using ‘cheap’ round-the-world (RTW) tickets offered by the major airline alliances to follow circular global routes in a continuous global direction. Leaving primarily from Europe, these tickets provided the opportunity to fulfill journeys efficiently giving backpackers the spatial potential and reach to experience the world and engage in ‘non-market’ activities (Debbage and Ioannides, 2004). These tickets are sold through all major global alliances such as Oneworld, Star Alliance\textsuperscript{110} and SkyTeam and offer integrated, seamless travel between carrier members. The tickets only allow a limited number of stops and the more connections requested, the more expensive the ticket becomes. Network rules mean backpackers are limited to flight carriers within the network and cannot backtrack on the route. Because the backpacker must stay within the network, consumers have to travel to hubs (London, Buenos Aires, Bangkok)\textsuperscript{111}, which means flying longer, often within inconvenient routes to stay in network. None of these tickets are valid for more than one year from date of departure, those planning to travel longer requiring a series of (expensive) one-way tickets. This choice is proving more difficult, the lack of forwarding tickets leading to increasing difficulties at borders.

While these alliances have global network coverage, most members are based in particular geographical regions, leaving many regions uncovered and switched off (i.e. most of Africa, China, parts of Northern Europe, Central America) with ‘people and territories dubbed as irrelevant from the perspective of dominant interests’ (Castells, 1997: 1). Those regions or countries with limited infrastructure or connection to these global alliances or countries without national flag carriers face a major challenge when attracting backpackers. The lack of membership of an airline alliance is a major disadvantage for South Africa, with only five percent of United Kingdom backpackers travelling to Australia via South Africa (Rogerson, 2007; Visser, 2003; Visser et al, 2004). The lack of transport means such countries rarely

\textsuperscript{108} http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,909595,00.html
\textsuperscript{109} Luxembourg allowed them to land even though the airline refused to join IATA, as Luxembourg had no flag carrier of its own.
\textsuperscript{110} Star Alliance has nineteen members that serve nearly 1,000 destinations, with over 2,000 jet aircraft in service.
\textsuperscript{111} Cities across the world have seen their scheduled services disappear as the global recession continues, there are places that go ‘with the flow’, moving closer to global networks while other places are left ‘behind’ moving farther away (Urry, 2007: 265).
feature in backpacker’s geographic imaginaries, imaginaries that need such transport systems to facilitate mobility. Just as long-haul jets in the 1960’s helped Australia at least in geographical terms to become part of backpacker itineraries, I argue that global, national and local transportation systems are vital components to how backpacking as a flow is ordered, transport systems acting both as a liberalising and constraining mechanism. While backpacking is not entirely structured by roads, flight routes, airports, railways and bus lines, they do encourage, facilitate and channel movement.

6.4 Spaces of Mobility: Infrastructures for Mobility.

Immobile ‘transfer points’, ‘nodes’, ‘spaces of transition’\(^{112}\), ‘institutional moorings’ and ‘places of in-between-ness’ (Adey, 2006; Hannam et al, 2006) are marked by mobility and motion, where the ‘mobility flows of passengers, goods, materials, information and so on intersect’ (Adey, 2006: 75-76) and individuals engage without ‘cultural’ mediation (Augè, 1995; Gottdiener, 2001). From lounges, leisure complexes, galleries, check-in areas, waiting rooms, airports, motels, motorways, garages, docks, railway stations and harbours, these spaces of mobility are the pragmatic spaces described by Augè (1995: 78) as marked by ‘the fleeting, the temporary and ephemeral’. They are spaces where people co-exist without socialising or communicating with one another (Bassoli and Martin, 2006), where ‘all ties are suspended and time stretched to a sort of continuous present’ (Braidotti, 1994: 18-19). These spaces emphasise movement, speed, mobility and circulation, representing ‘neither arrival nor departure, but the ‘pause’ (Morris, 1988a: 3). They are described as both a ‘launching point for strange and wonderful voyages (...) a place of collection, juxtaposition and passionate encounter’ and ‘somewhere you pass through, where the encounters are fleeting, arbitrary (...) as a station, airport terminal, hospital and so on’ (Clifford, 1992: 96). While such systems facilitate the shrinkage of the globe, enabling global mobility to occur, they lack the particular histories and traditions that mark ‘spaces of encounter’ from which interactions occur and subjectivities emerge. Since backpackers have some basic requirements for fixity beyond mobility systems, Massey (2005: 95) notes the ‘impetus to motion and mobility, for a space of flows, can only be achieved through the construction of (temporary, provisional) stabilizations’ where subjectivities are constructed, negotiated and refined. While we may move individually, research regularly ignores ‘the patterns in which human objects directly interact together,

\(^{112}\) Transition from the sphere of one way of life to another, by enacting movement from one geographical locale to another, availing him or herself with a ‘series of conceptual substitutes .. like the stamping of a passport at a border checkpoint, provide him only with the formal means of crossing a boundary: they simply indicate a transition from one bounded domain to another has taken place or the limit of one horizon has ended and another begun’ (Islam, 1996: 136).
ignoring the ‘underlying physical or material infrastructures that orchestrate and underlie such economic, political and social patterns’ (Urry, 2007: 19). Backpacker (claims for) a new subjectivity link particular places together requiring ‘participants to set aside not only a specific time but also a shared or shareable space, as well as generally constraining other activities at the same time or location’ (Boden and Molotch, 2004: 103). Lefebvre (1991a) argues that these social spaces are socially produced and meaningfully constructed, ‘the locus of the coexistence of social positions, mutually exclusive points’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 130), which form the basis of the viewpoints of their occupants. Bourdieu argues social space tends to be translated, ‘with more or less distortion, into physical space, in the form of a certain arrangement of agents and properties’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 134), where:

… the action of groups, factors within knowledge, within ideology or within the domain of representation…Social space contains a great diversity of objects, both natural and social, including the networks and pathways which facilitate the exchange of material things and information. Such ‘objects’ are thus not only things but also relations… Social labour transforms them, rearranging their positions within spatio-temporal configurations. (Lefebvre, 1991a: 77).

Backpacking constitutes a social and cultural phenomenon, where complex orderings of people, technologies, institutional arrangements, mythologies and activities serve to structure and organise space, where participation in the world is lived, experienced, felt and practiced with others in particular times and places, ‘a practice, a doing, an event, a becoming – a material and social reality’ (Dodge and Kitchin, 2005: 172). From the Beats to the drifters and other representational types produced through common, repetitive, patterned movements, representational spaces overlay physical space. These are the spaces where individuals can work and interact, articulating their mobility within a coded infrastructure where interactions, encounters and transactions bind them together. Much like the creative workers and businessmen who seek out distinct restaurants, clubs and bars to demonstrate ‘urban sociability’ (Urry, 2007: 243) and ‘schmoozing’ (Aubert-Gamet and Cova, 1999), the Beat pads113 in the 1950’s were a space for writers and artists to gather, share meals and prepare literary magazines, sculptures, paintings and various crafts (Lawlor, 2005). They were spaces where ‘meetingness’, ‘proximity’, ‘co-presence’ and ‘sociality’ enabled rapidly circulating individuals to come together for physical co-presence and exchange, socialising individuals into a imagined world (community) and helping to create a sense of place. The pads, often with poor sanitation, bare mattresses

113 Much like the hippie enclaves in the sixties, these ‘pads’ came to be associated with site of ‘squalor, drug use, and sexual promiscuity’ (Lawlor, 2005: 271).
and little furniture came into being as Beat writers and artists moved into the cities, creating enclaves in areas surrounding Columbia University, the Lower East Side in Manhattan, the Greenwich Village area of New York, the Venice Beach Area near Los Angeles, and the North beach area of San Francisco, their revolving occupancy depending on need and inclination. Soon, these enclaves saw the emergence of hippies, the ‘flowering’ of cities usually occurring in poor urban areas with cheap rent. Often evicted and harassed, as the drift east emerged, the drifters spatial practice/perceived space often contradicted the spatial practices of those they traversed, the drift coming to constitute spatio-temporal ‘routes’ (Lefebvre, 1991a) as they experienced time and space as sequential and unfolding. Within these blurred landscapes, rhythms emerged where shared body space and social spaces provided liminoid experiences and bonding, their ‘desire to belong (Probyn, 1996: 13) propelling them to proximity to reveal communal type living arrangements that were often marginal and precarious. Sustaining enclaves, transport systems, freak cafes, money exchange offices and accommodation, a networked ‘over land’ scene emerged as ‘hundreds of world travellers are huddled together in crash pads, town squares and on the back of buses’ (Neville, 1970: 212).

When drifting diminished in the mid 1970’s, partly because of spatial, temporal and social interference, coupled with the economic collapse in western economies, many of these systems and spaces collapsed or changed their orientation. However, the attributes, values and conventions of this form/type of travel had been clearly demonstrated with Mills (1973: 189) noting that ‘[t]he quicker that ‘hippies’ fade, the sooner they will have successors, similar in role and form, however much they differ in detail’. By the mid 1980’s when globalisation took on its more potent and comprehensive form (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006), backpacking emerged and what had been a generalised alienation from and opposition to society was re-worked through educational and touristic discourses. Mobility once invoked in the context of radical projects of destabilising discourses of power (Wolff, 1993) became centered on touristic discourse. Initially serviced by local agents, by the early 1990s, the scapes became characterised by a complex ordering of events, material goods, people, products and spaces, dependent upon particular networks of technologies, capital, objects, information and knowledge, regulated by political, institutional forces and expert systems that could ‘mitigate the risks of such physical travel’ (Simmel, 1997: 167).

From the moment an individual conceives of a trip, Suvantola (2002) argues we choose the discourse within which we operate and is dependent on a range of institutions, structures,
processes and agents, backpacker habitation of the scapes, enveloping them within flows of capital, knowledge, ideas, people, information, objects, stories and technologies which come together to (re)produce backpacking and its distinct structure, tempo and rhythm.

The social space surrounding backpacker discourse embodies the logic of the scapes, representing the cultural values individuals have come to expect from backpacking, shared physical space attaining ‘real’ existence ‘by virtue of networks and pathways, by virtue of bunches or clusters of relationships’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 86), embodied materially in the scapes, frozen into a solid structures, where the ‘will to connection’ (Simmel, 1997: 171) exists. Rather than being pushed to the margins like the drifters, societies facilitate backpacker mobility, organising space for it (Verheyen, 2003), infrastructure not an end in itself, but ‘usually an answer to a question, the satisfaction of a need, a facility’ (Verheyen, 2003: 294). These spaces are a fundamental element of the way a backpacker encounters the scapes, ‘infrastructures of naming, infrastructures of mobility, infrastructures of separation, infrastructures of interaction, and so on’ (Dourish and Bell, 2007) underpinning everyday action. These ‘spaces of identification’ (Malbon, 1998: 280) and the encounters they enable might be called transient, fleeting and even ephemeral but they are not ‘incidental’, common identification proving the validly and stability for ‘transnational’ social spaces.

These spatial entities are constructed through the networks of mobility that connect backpackers across time and space, and consist of spaces of differing scales and sizes, and while they are not shared, used or valued by all, they become self-sustaining. While the members of the ‘Cyclists Touring Club’ in 1930’s in Britain ‘patronized their own network’ (Walker, 1985: 146), creating and sustaining accommodation and eateries listed in their own publications, self-drive travellers developed into a separate form of travel with its own routes and accommodation (Shih, 2006). Recreational Vehicle (RV) owners in America utilise 24 hour Wal-Mart’s parking for overnight stays and meeting others (much to the disquiet of campsite owners and often Wal-Mart). The relationships between petrol stations and motorists (Normark, 2006), road cafes and lorry drivers (Bugler, 1966), hobo and jungle camps in post depression America (DePastino, 2003) have also been well documented. The relationships between mobile-subject types and social spaces are vital in identity formation, as these spaces can orchestrate and direct forms of social life by bringing together dispersed populations, evoking even if temporarily a sense of communal

114 The RV community in the United States (who call themselves Wally Worlders) have numerous websites about staying at Wal-Marts. While a company has produced a ‘Wal-Mart Map Overnight Free Parking Guide’, a documentary by Doug Hawes-Davis called ‘This is Nowhere’ was released in 2002.
living, spaces that can be 'vibrant and imaginative' (McKay, 1996: 71). Whether it is networking places for new media people, eco-lodges for eco-tourists, ethnic cafes for migrants, churches and shrines for pilgrims, social space can enable symbolic and physical identification, social life and mobility itself as they rally people on the basis of a common identification and by trading on particular goods, words, visual resources, desires, aspirations, images, values and commodities, which have unique exchange value within each particular imagined world (community).

The scapes incorporate an assemblage of social spaces that are imbued with meaning, spaces that are constantly re-articulated along networks of mobility, framing learning, consumption and performance, enabling the play of discourse and practices that 'figure' selves within 'figured worlds' (Bourdieu, 1977). The identities that individuals gain in these social spaces are 'specifically historical developments, grown through continued participation in the positions defined by the social organisation of those world’s activity' (Holland et al, 1998: 41). Helping to articulate an embodied involvement in the world, these spaces enable individuals to identity with the role of backpacker, where one is visible and readable to others and can become an accepted portal of entry into the scapes. They are specific 'behaviour settings' (Barker, 1968); 'places where it is possible to recognize oneself while identifying oneself with a community, places where without being in control of the future, the present is looked after' (Aubert-Gamet and Cova, 1999: 40). Increasingly dense on structured routes, these spaces might include enclaves, campsites, restaurants, types of accommodation, bars and nightclubs, internet cafes, travel agents, tourist offices, hostels, cafes along with places (sites, sights) that sustain encounters with others. These 'vibrant meeting places en-route' (Westerhausen and MacBeth, 2003: 73) are 'like magnets in a stream of charged particles' (ibid, 73), 'gathering places' (Vogt, 1976: 36) that can make an imagined world very visible and negotiable (Römhild, 2002). These spaces offer 'a degree of permanence, of fixity of form and identity' (Hudson, 2005: 17) where individuals can be themselves, in sites that validate their identity and which they can call their own, helping them to overcome distance and structure their daily activities. This process demands a partial unbundling of the local, creating spaces of mobility that are a key resource for self-formation operating 'as settings for the performances of both producers and consumers, helping to establish the precise character of a tourism product and its performance' (Crang, 1997: 143). Inscribed in 'circles of anticipation, performance and remembrance' (Baerenhold et al, 2004: 3) meaningful movements shape material,
existential spaces, which in turn might shape practices\(^\text{115}\).

The decision to visit, pass through and/or stay within social spaces / rest-points where co-presence and face-to-face contact is expected is made for many reasons, but not simply for the transient encounters available there. While meeting people is one of the main characteristics of backpacking (Binder, 2004; Cohen, 1973; Murphy, 2001), such spaces also serve to organise and support specific ways of experiencing the world. They become an important conduit in the exchange process whether it is the exchange of ideas, rumours, sexual favours, gossip, information and/or material goods, where costs, risks and experiences can be shared and a range of travel experiences supported. These spaces do not pre-exist but are brought into being, defining the situation, setting the scene, from within which the performance can unfold (Goffman, 1969a), ‘[m]ost tourism performances are performed collectively, and this sociality is in part what makes them pleasurable’ (Larsen, 2008: 28). Formed through mobility and occasional moments of proximity and intermittent movement, many of these sites have become ritual and habitual, social spaces deeply connected to shared aspirations, values and practice, set to the logic, truths of the field and the resources of their users. While meeting other travellers may be secondary to meeting ‘locals, (Obenour et al, 2006; Cohen, 1973; Binder, 2004; Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1985) these spaces are often presented on the possibility of doing so. Without interactions with other backpackers which form and dissipate quickly (Elserud, 1998; Riley, 1988, Murphy, 2001), backpacking would not happen, since the socialising effect is central to how backpacking gets (re)produced, the glue of ‘relations between actors or collectivities, organised as regular social practices’ (Giddens, 1979: 66) existing ‘syntagmatically in the flow of time’ (ibid, 66).

6.5 Backpacker Hostels.

Backpacker hostels, the network of backpacker oriented accommodations, have become a key building block and important, if not an integral institutional infrastructure within backpacking. A powerful framing reference and a key mobility and consumption junction, they embody the ‘badges of honour’ (low price, locations, common areas), ‘congruent with the social spaces (defined by activities and human groups)’ (Alexander, 1977: 941). An integral part of the social construction of reality, ‘with reference to which, and in terms of

\(^{115}\) Winston Churchill understood this well when, in 1944, before the House of Commons, he said, ‘[w]e shape our buildings, and afterwards our buildings shape us’ (Roth, 1993: 48). The comment was made during a speech about rebuilding the House of Commons, October 28, 1944.
which, individuals make decisions and orient their behaviour (Jenkins, 1996: 127), hostels afford a distinct stage for performing backpacking spatially and socially, exerting a strong spatial, social and temporal dominance on daily activities and everyday life. While Starr (1999: 377) suggested that the study of infrastructure was the study of boring things, it is an important (even if sometimes mundane, unnoticed and embedded) part of a backpacker’s life. Backpackers and hostels as ‘infrastructure’ and ‘structure’ are co-actors; where agency and structure are not considered as two separate concepts as they reciprocally influence each other (Verbeek and Mommaas, 2008). Having been placed and become known, connected and linked to; symbolically, discursively and materially with backpacking (Firth and Hing, 1999; Hampton, 1998; Hecht and Martin, 2006; Nash et al, 2006), the backpacker hostel is a space made to happen, constructed through and a by-product of individual mobility, where a ‘commonality of experience’ is expected (Obenour et al, 2006). Rather than a pre-existing ‘stage’, they are performed into being, their ‘network effect’ taking precedence over any single hostel. Richards and Wilson (2004a) commenting on a ATLAS/ISTIC study note that backpacker hostels were used by almost 70% of ‘backpackers’ compared with only 19% of ‘tourists’, a finding backed up by a 2008 UNWTO report on youth tourism. Characterised by their common areas and communal living, ‘inhabitants recognized each other, knew what they could or should do, and what relationships they could develop with each other’ (Aubert-Gamet and Cova, 1999), behaving in line with the specific logic of the field. In 1932, when the first meeting of the International Youth Hostel Federation was held in Amsterdam, 2,123 youth hostels were in operation (Clarke, 2004a) but by 2008 there were some 1.6 million-bed spaces in almost 8,000 youth and backpacker hostels (UNWTO, 2008).

The hostel itself grew out of the ‘freak hotels’, the accommodation of choice for the drifters that emerged in the 1960’s since the tourism industry did not initially support their mobility or organise space for them; counter-spaces that rose on the margins of the homogenized realm (Lefebvre, 1991a). Spatialised and socialised actors, they needed one another and developed specific forms of being with and for one another. Highlighting the reciprocal nature of their relationship, Cohen noted the nascent ‘drifter’ flows that began to flow along parallel geographic lines to more mainstream tourism, ‘institutionalised on a level completely segregated from, but parallel to ordinary mass tourism’ (Cohen, 1973: 90).

116 Starr (1999) outlined the properties of infrastructure, which include embeddedness (sunk into social arrangements); transparency in use (supports mobility in a routined manner); reach or scope (going beyond a single event or one-site); being learned as a part of membership (taken-for-granted arrangements); linked to conventions of practice (shapes and is shaped by the conventions of a community of practice); embodying standards (plugging into other infrastructures and tools in a standardized fashion); dependency on an installed base; visibility upon breakdown; and being fixed incrementally rather than globally.
Initially, they congregated in parks, town and city centres, sleeping rough until the police, judicial and park authorities regulated against their practice of sleeping on public spaces. They went on to seek ‘out some cheap and conveniently located hostels, eating places, coffee houses and similar establishments, originally catering to the lower-class local population, or some non-commercial establishments’ (Cohen, 1973: 97) where ‘youngsters exchange information, buy and sell their belongings, or smoke pot’.

Travelling ‘outside the established tourist circuit – both geographically and socially’ they made use of local opportunities for lodging and eating, the cheap and conveniently located hotels becoming known as ‘freak hotels’ which acted simultaneously as lodging, meeting places and eating places. Loker-Murphy and Pearce (1985: 824) noted how these developed into an infrastructure catering specifically for the drifters, comprising of ‘inexpensive transportation systems, with low-priced hotels and youth hostels surrounded by psychedelic shops, nightclubs, and coffee houses’. Cohen (1973) noted these ‘drifter-establishments’ were of low-grade and low-rate services, but still thrived, since at these locations, this imagined world could materialise and establish itself. Cohen (1973: 101) argues that the ‘ordinary caterer can expect little benefit’ from this infrastructure from it while the ‘intrusion of the drifters into the itineraries and facilities used by ordinary tourists could spell a loss for the tourist establishment, since it antagonises the other tourists, for whom drifters are often anathema’. Tourists with high economic and cultural capital tended to maintain spatial arrangements different separately from those individuals with low economic capital, neither finding value in each other’s company or spatial arrangements.

Drifting soon became institutionalised with its own routes (Hampton, 1998), accommodation (Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995) and enclaves (Howard, 2007), the institutionalisation manifesting itself in the emergence of ‘fixed travelling patterns, established routines and a system of tourist facilities and services catering specifically to the youthful mass-tourist’ (Cohen, 1973: 95). Not noted for their amenity value or hygiene, these meeting places (and their staff, notice boards and visitor books) became infamous, hotels such as the Pudding Shop, New Gulhane, Gulhane Oteli, Yeners and the Gulhane (Istanbul), Gulha, Baghdad, Amir Kabir (Tehran); Smoky Joe’s (Tangier), Thai Song Green (Bangkok), Tibetan Blue, the Eden, Jed Singh, Matchbox and the Hotchpotch (Kathmandu), the Crown Hotel (Delhi), Baghdad, Bamian, Noor and Ariana (Kabul) and the Modern Lodge (Calcutta) creating legends, stories and myths. Made popular through word of mouth and later alternative guidebooks such as ‘Play Power’ (Neville, 1970), these spaces soon became ‘absorbed in the network’, in which ‘no place exists by itself’ since
each hostel / hotel became ‘defined by flows’ (Castells, 1996: 412-3) or more accurately, the speed of movement through which individuals journeyed east.

6.5.1 Backpacker Hostels: Network Power.

Being folded into the scapes is traditionally seen as the first stage of the tourism area lifecycle for places (Brenner and Fricke, 2007), backpacker accommodation a vehicle for locals to invest, since locals are characterised as better positioned to meet backpacker needs without major investment (Scheyvens, 2002a,b). Low entry requirement and low running costs should mean locals would benefit most from backpacking, their economic spend higher than mass tourism as they stay longer, spreading their money over a wider geographic area and tend to purchase more locally produced goods and services (Cohen, 1982a; Hampton, 1998; Speed and Harrison, 2004; Welk, 2004). By the early 1980’s, Cohen (1982a) noted that on the beaches of Southern Thailand, restricted access to capital meant local ownership of backpacker accommodation became vulnerable to being taken over by outside interests, ‘[t]he existence of flourishing backpacker centres frequently inviting a ‘hostile takeover’ of local tourism structures by outside operators and competing tourism sectors’ (Westerhausen and Macbeth, 2003: 72). Brenner and Fricke (2007: 225-226) found that in Zipolite, Mexico, ‘developer-tourists’ had expressly entered the market to build backpacker infrastructure, their access to investment capital and business acumen meaning they had a head start compared to the local population, gaining control over and dominating the backpacker accommodation segment. The (perceived) market potential of durable ‘thick flows’ coupled with a global relaxation of foreign ownership rules, free movement of labour and knowledge means (tourist) developers, transnational companies and investment firms who have the necessary capital, expertise and knowledge of the required ‘atmosphere’, are very well placed to challenge ‘wide local ownership’ (Wilson, 1997: 63). As hostels have become a way of movement (and being moved), ‘lifted up to become a symbol of a certain lifestyle’ (Yakhlef, 2004: 247), performed and practiced into being by backpacker mobility, in a way that is neither ‘perfectly ordered nor anarchic’ (Sheller and Urry, 2006: 216), the flow of backpackers has attracted an increasing amount of private investors and transnational investment (Starwood, Accor SA) both for profit making (Peel and Steen, 2006) and even as part of local, regional and national government strategy (Prideaux and Coghlan, 2006; Prideaux and Cooper, 2006) given the connection between these spaces and mobility. Visser (2004) notes how the ‘hostel’ design has been exported to South Africa, the backpacker sector emulating ‘first world’ backpacker hostel
designs from Australia and New Zealand rather than using local materials and designs, cultural intermediaries rendering it amenable to standardisation and capitalist production techniques.

The hostel has become a sort of ‘universal cultural space’ (Rojek, 1995: 146) where knowing individuals can anticipate and rely on the same aesthetic and spatial references wherever one is in the world, offsetting the affects of transnational movement. Firms and entrepreneurs, not surprisingly, have followed this privileged flow, funneling their investment into “cherry picking’ high demand, low risk, and low cost areas to try and maximize profits’ (Graham, 2004: 17), making the future of small independent hostels uncertain (Clarke, 2004a; Peel and Steen, 2007). Backpacker hostels are also part of economic regeneration strategies to attract ‘the right sort of people’, to (regenerated) areas, town centres and marginal areas. For areas that are increasingly in competition to attract mobile capital or mobile people (Hall, 2005b), the intimate relationship between hostel infrastructure and mobility has drawn in private investors, local authority funding and public-private partnerships. Scheyvens (2002b: 157) notes how ‘the development of backpacker enclaves has transformed some run-down, crime-ridden parts of cities’ given that backpackers are characterised as being young, fit, healthy, single and affluent. The ability of backpackers and the infrastructure to gentrify areas has also been noted in run-down, crime-ridden parts of cities such as red light districts from Yogyakarta (Indonesia) to Sydney Kings Cross (Scheyvens, 2002b; Visser, 2004; Howard, 2007), but also leading to marginal locals (the elderly, homeless, drug users /dealers, the mentally ill) being pushed out (Lenskyj, 2002). In 2007, a public -private partnership with Hostelling International (HI) was announced as a centrepiece to revitalise downtown Winnipeg (Canada). HI Regional Director Dylan Rutherford, said the area ‘wasn’t attracting the best crowd117- a case of public funding in serving a predominately non-local market. Backpackers are the ‘right kind of transnationals’ (Clarke, 2005), a 2008 Suffolk University study finding one HI hostel (Boston) and its 32,800 annual guests pumped about $12.5 million into the local economy annually (Rivers et al, 2008) by creating a market for and food, drink and souvenirs (Clarke, 2005).

6.5.2 Backpacker Hostels: Performing Hostels.

Hostels are the most visible, material and symbolic part of the scapes, part of the

---

117 http://tinyurl.com/y9e9nq4
backpacking role, a ‘referential framework for the planning of a trip, but also a script for how to perform and perhaps reconfigure their own identities within the desired setting’ (Jansson, 2007: 11; original emphasis). Hostels have become so prevalent that some scholars argue that modern backpacking was born out of and is maintained by backpacker hostels (Pearce, 1990; Slaughter, 2004) with Wilson et al. (2007: 199) asserting that Australia ‘gained a competitive advantage in the global backpacker market because of its rapid and extensive institutionalisation and commercialisation of backpacker travel’. Backpackers at the start of their journey and hostels are thus locked into a ‘fluid self-reinforcing system’ (Urry, 2005: 239), significant to those who pass through them, even though they do not necessarily have to consist of similar people (age, gender, nationality). However, an ‘imagined sameness’ (Gullestad, 2001) means an imagined representational space where one expects to find like-minded others sharing the same set of particular values and patterns of movement. Even though individuals will not know exactly who will be encountered in these sites, the presence of other backpackers provides the reassurance that you are in the right place; the ability of an actor to participate in the network determined by whether they are seen as contributing to the goals of the network. This has seen such businesses denying entry to those who are unable or unwilling to perform supporting roles or lacking the communality of experience that backpackers require of each other. This also extends to individuals or groups that refuse to comply with the role expected as social space permits ‘fresh social actions to occur, while suggesting others and prohibiting yet others’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 73). Creating a space for performance also means restricting the mobility of others seen as undesirable, economically marginal, immobile or disruptive, which usually manifests itself by refusing entry to locals even as paying guests (Hutnyk, 1996; Visser, 2003).

Spinney (2007: 26) argues this current wisdom is based largely upon ideas of segregating mobility so as to accommodate unambiguous, predictable and productive mobility rather than conceiving mobility as messy, unpredictable and dynamic. These ‘undesirable individuals’ are identified by how they look, their bodies ‘maps of meaning’ (Coleman and Sim, 2000; Mansvelt, 2005); embodied displays routinely scrutinised to identify bodies that are ‘out of place’ (Cresswell, 2001b; Morgan and Pritchard, 2005b). This policy has seen Australians (including native Aboriginals) in Australia<sup>118</sup>, Israelis in India<sup>119</sup> and even English tourists in Wales excluded from hostels (O’ Regan, 2010). Simply being a local,

<sup>118</sup> http://tinyurl.com/3dj4tj
<sup>119</sup> http://tinyurl.com/3d5vl
identifiable by their lack of an international passport\footnote{http://tinyurl.com/yf4hcol} is enough to bar entry, given that they might impinge, create a disturbance and fracture the stability of a subjectivity-in-process by threatening the symbolic boundaries of the self. From the networks of mobility to the addresses and entrances to backpacker spaces such as hostels, they are hidden and are ‘known only to – and hence are only supposed to be found by – exceptional privileged people’ (Koskela, 2000: 248) in backpacker spaces online, sacred texts such as Lonely Planet or and through word of mouth. Skeggs (2004: 165) argues that it is now proximity not distance that matters, arguing '[t]he dangerous other does not threaten; rather, the proximate stranger who is not easily identifiable presents anxieties’. Hostel owners argue that is their business, catering to international tourists, and that they have a duty of care to guard against inter-cultural misunderstandings by serving as a ‘buffer against culture confusion’ (Hottola, 2005: 5) on such issues such as personal space, privacy, gender and sexuality. Having been given and taken on a greater role in affording, enabling and selling a certain lifestyle by offering textual, spatial and visual fixing and interpretation, hostels are becoming increasingly adept at providing and organising scripts, interconnecting with specialised transport companies and other backpacker operators to manage a stage on which interaction can be carried out, a type of encapsulation, where the space is stage-managed, ‘a strategy for maintaining spatial and imaginary boundaries’ (Jansson, 2007: 9). An encapsulated spell allows for an ‘imagined' world (community) to take hold but ‘in order not to break the spell, people are obliged to act in an appropriate manner – to play the right game’ (Jansson, 2007). These hostel performances mean the boundaries of self are not brought into question (Sibley, 2001), as hostels mediate between the backpacker and otherness, between edge and risk or any intrusion that might produce anxiety, while the individual backpackers themselves, if threatened by others can retreat to increasingly common private rooms. There is no doubt that as hostel audiences become mixed, they will contain a larger number of backstage or ‘back-region’ areas (Goffman, 1969a) such as private rooms, installation of Wi-Fi in communal areas, TV rooms, private cinemas, meaning front-stage ‘face-work’ or presence and performance before a particular set of observers can be knowingly avoided. While the décor and layout of a hostel lobby once meant creating a very different experience from that encountered at a five star hotel, individuals are coming to expect very tangible and physical evidence of a servicescape (Bitner, 1992), whether it be internet access that works, English speaking staff, en-suite
rooms to a level of performance from ‘management’ and staff.

Saturated with a particular (primarily western) cultural orientation, a bank of expertise has developed around backpacking, where a reflexive group of managers, professionals and lifestyle entrepreneurs have embedded themselves within the scapes and who are adept at mediating backpacker desires, itineraries, and experiences. Some countries like Australia and New Zealand have attained a bank of institutional knowledge, experience and expertise about the scapes\textsuperscript{121}, shaping a networked infrastructure and management style in hostels that is predictable and standardised even if not under single ownership, ensuring the same ‘service’ or ‘product’ is expected and ‘delivered in more or less the same way across the network’ (Urry, 2005: 245). Like ‘theoretical places’ (systems and totalising discourses) (de Certeau, 1988: 38), hostels are now ‘proper places’ that have the sanction of tourist discourse, where every comfort has to be paid for, standardised in arrangement and ‘can be circumscribed as proper (propre) and thus serves as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it’ (de Certeau, 1988: xix; original emphasis).

Exported around the globe, they are now located in city and town centres, joining guidebooks and other backpacker spaces that confine the individual to the ‘backpacker’ role, the flow of experiences channeled by the material frames the touristic infrastructure provides (Suvantola, 2002).

6.6 Backpacker Enclaves.

The countercultural imagination was made very visible in numerous cities and towns in North America and western Europe as they appropriated urban centres or ‘enclaves’, where people began to congregate not along class lines but through shared identification and affinities\textsuperscript{122}, setting up ‘crash pads,’ ‘communal’ houses and an array of restaurants, cafes, rock clubs and bookstores. They borrowed concepts (and geographic space) from the dominant culture and subverted them so that they could pursue an alternative way of life, transforming their everyday life into something more heroic (Stahl, 2003). Districts and streets like the Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco, Old Town in Chicago, Sunset Strip in Los Angeles and the Lower East Side in New York City began ‘to flower’ (Farber and Bailey, 2001), the countercultural imagination spreading to Carnaby Street in London, Dam Square

\textsuperscript{121} In Australia, part from numerous industry conferences, expositions associations and reports, their universities have been at the forefront of teaching tourism students about backpacking (http://tinyurl.com/ya2c3r7). In New Zealand and Australia, there is a dedicated awards program for the independent travel sector called the Golden Backpack Awards.

\textsuperscript{122} Mitchell (1967) in the village Voice wrote they came to the Haight, ‘with a great need and a great hunger for a loving community. Many, wanting to belong, identified with the superficial aspects of what ‘hippie’ was. They didn’t drop out but rather changed roles’ (Russell, 1999: 74).
in Amsterdam and Christiania in Denmark with most western European capitals having some hippie district, street or enclave. The drift East meant meant ‘typical’ habits, discourse and action were exported, enclaves appearing in Istanbul, Kathmandu, Delhi, Goa and Manali, often becoming bottlenecks, where hundreds of drifters congregated, forming an overland ‘scene’ which the underground press reported in great detail often noting which hostels, hotels, cafes, bars, record stores made the cut and which did not (Sobocinska, 2006, 2008). Sustained by transnational activity, a product as well as a source of (sub)cultural capital, these enclaves were sustained at a number of popular points along ‘networks of mobility’. These enclaves remained and spread throughout the eighties (Howard, 2005, 2007; Peel and Steen, 2007; Westerhausen, 2002; Richards and Wilson, 2004a,b,c; Gogia, 2006; Teo and Leong, 2006), and at any one time, contain ‘a temporary mass of itinerant pleasure seekers’ (Allon, 2004: 50). Allowing for a very large amount of backpackers and other tourists to engage in small geographic areas, they offer familiarisation and socialisation, supporting a high degree of spatial cohesion directed by serving backpacker needs, little in the way of services or amenities geared towards residents (Gogia, 2006).

With cheap and familiar amenities and auxiliary services, backpackers can socialise, make travel arrangements, find inexpensive accommodation, bookstores, internet cafés, good phone connections, exchange kiosks, ATM machines, western food, while exchanging travel information (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2003; Sørensen, 2003). They can encompass towns, rural villages, city districts and streets and can be urban, rural, planned, unplanned, big, small, temporary and permanent, primarily emerging in an unplanned and contingent process. Numbering in the hundreds, they include Khao San Road (Bangkok), Pham Ngu Lao Street (Ho Chi Minh City), Kuta in Bali (Indonesia), Huaraz (Peru), Banos (Ecuador), Veng Vien (Laos), St Kilda's in Sydney (Australia), Thamel in Kathmandu (Nepal), Huguo Lu in Dali (China) and Yangshuo in China (Allon, 2004; Allon et al, 2008a,b; Howard, 2005, 2007; Murphy, 2001). These enclaves (which facilitate circulation) are similar to the transnational social spaces as defined by Pries (2001: 69), the ‘pluri-local frames of reference that structure everyday practices, social positions, employment trajectories and biographies, and human identities [that] simultaneously exist above and beyond the social contexts of national societies’ much like border zones, free trade zones, refugee camps and neighborhoods of exiles and guest workers. Like Sassen’s (1994: 85) ‘financial districts’ these enclaves are a ‘geography of practice’ where individuals have altered the territory allowed to them, the districts governed by their practices rather than national laws.
– practices that are often incongruent with the community at large, local customs and law. Like other touristic spaces, backpacker enclaves are largely liberal and open, liminoid spaces (Turner, 1969), spaces of consumption and pleasure where conduct is largely unsupervised (i.e., alcohol in Yogyakarta, Indonesia; drugs in Goa, India), creating a carnivalesque, permissive atmosphere where it is acceptable to over indulge and transgress with many cultural and socially inappropriate behaviours (Howard, 2007; Maoz, 2006).

Sites of ‘ordered disorder’, they encourage a ‘controlled de-control of the emotions’ (Featherstone, 1991: 78-82) which do not fit ‘into dominant representation of space’ (Hetherington, 1998: 149), where backpackers ‘rarely feel they are being watched, and thus act in what they perceive as a totally free and permissive environment’ (Maoz, 2006: 223-224). However, given their nature, enclaves can make anti social behaviour visible, enabling backpackers to take refuge from the more stressful ‘public spaces’, tourist space reflexivity divided between ‘authentic places’ and an ‘accessory (but often overlaid) metaspace where the business of tourism is conducted’ (Frow, 1997: 75). The locus of control remains with backpackers, bringing them into contact with the Other in a ‘controlled way’ (Wilson and Richards, 2007: 24), viewing ‘the people, places, and culture of [that] society through the protective walls of his familiar ‘environmental bubble’ (Cohen, 1972: 166-167) with little evidence of ‘backpackers establishing contact with local people unless it was for commercial transactions’ (Aziz, 1999). Locally based but transnationally shaped, linked and connected (Beck, 2008), backpackers can make a significant contribution to a city or country’s economy, and are often represented the most lively and productive parts of a city or town. The Khao San Road (KSR) / Banglamphu area in Bangkok is one of the cities busiest, its streets continually made and remade by backpackers, the performance of the scapes sustaining the cheap food vendors, bars, coffee shops but also hotels, Starbucks, boutiques and spas. Backpackers are reduced to the common denominator of participant (Shields, 1991: 89), the enclaves neither global nor local, neither ‘globalized’ local sites or ‘thoroughly commodified’ zones of western capitalist desire. Complex constructions, they are sites of dynamic relations and contestation, places of ‘movement’, implicated within complex ‘networks by which hosts, guests, buildings, objects, and machines are contingently brought together’ (Sheller and Urry, 2006: 214), spatial mobility and speed of circulation articulated in the centre of the scapes keeping backpackers tied to the popular enclaves, each one linked to the next by shared beliefs, the common repertoire of symbolic representations and a shared understanding of what they offer.
6.7 Contextualising the Imagination.

Backpacking has been placed in a very different category to mainstream tourism, one that rests on complex and fluid ‘scapes’; producing (and being produced by) its own systems of interrelated and increasingly interconnected institutions, transports, guidebooks, material structures, routes and spaces of mobility and consumption. These systems and spaces, through which ‘various stages/phases can be performed and practised’ (Hudson, 2005: 17) are not only shaped by discursive practice, performed into existence by a spatial logic, but by a profusion of reflexive and discursive resources that help (re)produce it, creating space ‘which guarantee that it endures’, achieving consistency and coherence ‘by intervening in social space and in its production’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 44). The scapes are not a pre-given and pre-determined reality, external to the actor, their practices of space and patterns of movement creating a structured coherence, where fluid but enduring paths invite material investment. Various systems, institutions and infrastructure have developed and spread, making movement possible and providing ‘spaces of anticipation’ (Urry, 2007). As they move geographically, they come to be situated temporally in different settings and while often temporary and ephemeral, these locations of practice are also related to structural conditions. While the scapes boundaries remain vague and fluid, their coherence is strong enough to hold together ‘the material and the ideal, the solid and the superficial’ (Cresswell, 2003: 272), a coherence made possible through a heterogeneous assemblage of things, people, ideas, technologies, places, peoples, texts, images, practices that are brought into alignment so as to together enable it to expand and to reproduce itself across the globe’ (Urry, 2002: 144, original emphasis). Today, few countries are untouched by backpacking, its discourse, institutions and those who perform it into being, guidebooks leaving few countries unmarked and transport technologies making travel very accessible.

Representations of space and representational spaces are central in contributing in different ways ‘to the production of space’ (Lefebvre, 1991), spaces that profoundly stabilise the scapes and allow ideas, information and narratives to circulate, the development of dedicated spaces of mobility enabling backpackers to get in touch with the scapes (and each other), backpacking partly defined by ‘mobility between and within such spaces’ (Edensor, 2006: 209).

I argued that these and spaces were born out of a logic that developed during the drift east, their world view created a self-identifying world which solidified through the construction
and appropriation of systems and spaces that facilitated their mobility, a layer of social and material reality that lay beyond the intentions of any one individual. Drifting could not have existed without the diverse contributions from countercultural leaders, entrepreneurs, underground press, visas, passports, buses, cars and buildings that combining with human actors and a complaint social, political and legal environment, all of which ultimately formed the very life-world that enfolded them. While not seen as having as much an impact as the railway, jet airline or roadside motel on the evolution of modern travel, the freak buses and hotels enabled a large section of the ‘baby-boomer’ generation to adopt modes of drifter-style travel (cf. van Egmond, 2007), enabling those who followed to spawn a separate touristic infrastructure that stretched across Europe to India and Nepal as far as China and Australia. While the tourism industry, the media, tourists and other actors could find no reason why relatively affluent westerners would use cheap, unhygienic freak hotels, ashram’s, specific beaches (Anjuna Beach in Goa), cafes, music stores restaurants and enclaves, these spaces orchestrated new forms of social life, helping them to (strategically) overcome and (tactically) learn to live with distance and providing them with systems and spaces that had spatial reach. These spaces acted as a binding agent that brought individuals from around the globe congruently together, helping to create a series of linked places. These spaces became popular not simply due to their location on the route east but what they offered in terms of friendship, ritual, encounter, information, joint actions, intimacy and sociability, allowing for shared discursive and performative practices and routines to emerge which formed the basis for the institutionisation of drifting, ‘installing predictability and the regular ordering of bodies, things and spaces…as ideology and cultural impositions is inseparable from place making and the material’ (Edensor, 2006: 528-529). Even though the over land scene drew attention to its ‘institutionalisation’, these low budget operations were ignored and often forcibly shut down or pushed to the margins in towns and cities, stigmatised and made unattractive for investment or use by more conventional tourists, never attracting representation or large scale investments, which therefore reinforced their value in identity production.

I argue that the scapes (at least at their centre) circulate at speed, moving everything from bodies to objects, their mobility ‘always tending to reproduce the objective structures of which they are a product, they are determined by past conditions’ (Bourdieu, 2003: 72). One such structure, I argued is of vital importance is the backpacker hostel, which as

\[123\] Jenkins points out when people share similar habits, practical knowledge, assumptions and routines, and reflexively recognise a shared pattern that is inter-subjectively communicated, it is the ‘beginning of institutionisation’ (Jenkins, 1996: 128).
infrastructure, have inscribed themselves onto the scapes as social spaces of belonging and encounter, acting as a ‘mobility nexus’ (Normark, 2006) – a place of identity making and identity habit (Jenkins, 1996). Increasingly globalised as a generic symbol, tightly woven into the scapes, they facilitate a form of identification offering a calculated co-presence with other travellers; that might increase their own potential mobility, a ‘form of sociation … in the case of a wandering group in contrast to a spatially fixed one’ (Simmel, 1997: 160). While Bourdieu did not resort to metaphors of space, in research on the Kabyle dwelling’s in the 1960s, he characterised their dwellings as a ‘quasi-perfect coincidence between habitus and habitat (Bourdieu, 2000: 147), social spaces such as the hostel constituting an expressive potential for expressive practice, often dominating daily activities, a building block performed materially into being, symbolically connecting people and places across time/space. Because its is a social space converted into physical space remain a safe ground to prepare oneself a life in the scapes which over time might itself represent a social space. Popular since they make for easier for contact with others travellers in the scapes, hostels also stabilise backpacking in public imaginaries, part of a sign system through which backpackers can orient themselves and can be used to convey particular meanings and values allowing ‘particular embodied and material performances to occur’ (Bærenholdt et al, 2004: 139-140). Such performance may be something done for others as a display of identity, or for the self, in constituting and working identity’ (Crouch et al, 2001: 257). They have become a key infrastructure / foundational scaffold within backpacking; learned as a part of participation and becoming an integral part of the socialisation process. Hostels and other social spaces enable thick / rich, multi-layered and dense interaction (Urry, 2002); shared space becoming an important conduit in the exchange process whether it is the exchange of ideas, friendships, information and material goods, supporting a range of travel experiences from belonging, companionship, reflection and learning, in which an individual establishes ones place and identity in relation to others. Bringing backpacking into a very visible, material and social reality, giving material physical form to a particular narrative of self-identity (Giddens, 1991); these ‘visible institutional arrangements and practices’ (Uriely et al, 2002: 521) constitute a transnational social space; a distinct kind of practiced space that orchestrates a distinct form of social life.

The hostel network is not at the crust of being colonised by corporate giants, investment firms and for-profit entrepreneurs, but representations of space are increasingly evident in the scapes, the conceptualised space of planners, urbanists etc. that tends towards a
system of verbal signs (Lefebvre, 1991a), taking on a physical form in the form of guidebooks, maps and spaces that at times have ‘combined ideology and knowledge within a (socio-spatial) practice’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 45). These spaces ‘intervene’ by construction and by architecture, ‘as a project embedded in a spatial context and a texture which call for ‘representations’ that will not vanish into the symbolic or imaginary realms’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 42). The displacement of drifters / backpackers from sleeping in town squares and parks to specialised and standardised accommodation depends on holding spatial and social exclusivity, privileging differential mobilities through exclusion and segregation and marginalisation rather than by enabling any sort of ‘local’ contact or even low prices. Given structural priority, hostels are now located in city centres rather than in the margins and are given material, regulatory, social, cultural, economic and political support. As much as early hostels in England provided ‘a sense of institutionalised respectability for activities all too readily seen as subversive’ (Lowerson, 1980: 270) hostels can now produce a coherent and ‘unconflicting self’ (Caruana et al, 2008) for those starting their journey. As larger franchises and international companies become increasingly present at the centre of the scapes, ‘[l]andscapes of power can help to make particular ideologies and political practices more tangible, natural, familiar, acceptable, meaningful, and so on’ (Rajaram and Grundy-Warr, 2007: xxvii). From tourism professionals, lifestyle entrepreneurs, state agencies, governments, politicians, industry groups, non-profits to economic actors such as vendors, promoters, service and product providers, the ‘[e]xpectations of backpacker/hostel accommodation appear to be changing from the communal, cheap, ‘just a bed’ option that it once was believed to be…..to something more in line with the accommodation experience of the mainstream tourist’ (Cave et al, 2007: 245). As towns and cities seek to accommodate global capital, investment firms, large multinationals and state and national governments government have facilitated the planning or funding of hostels124, the countercultural imagination partially contextualised across the globe as part of the standard repertory in a form of pastiche (Appadurai, 1996).

As multinationals and other actors have sought to make the scapes more legible and understandable by encapsulating consumers, giving individuals enough autonomy so that they are seen to be and feel like they are socially constructing, not socially constructed (Thrift, 1996). Lefebvre (1991a) argues that we may never be sure whether representations of space have a practical impact, but as they become attractive to greater swaths of

124 The UNWTO (2008) noted that the rapidly developing backpacker industry has recently seen the creation of hostels with up to 1,000 beds in city centre locations in Europe and Australasia.
society, conflicts may arise between various ‘backpackers’: between domestic and international travellers (Obenour et al, 2004), solo travellers and travelling couples (Obenour et al, 2004), working holiday makers (WHM) and backpackers (Murphy, 2005), long term ‘translocal’ travellers and short term tourists (Korpela, 2007, 2009) and tourists and backpackers (Jack and Phipps, 2005). While these spaces increasingly come into existence ‘from above’, ‘(re)production is never assured, for despite the prevalence of codes and norms, tourist conventions can be destabilized by rebellious performances, or by multiple, simultaneous enactions on the same stage’ (Edensor, 2001: 60). The fact that hostels are now considered ‘proper’ is a victory of space over time (De Certeau, 1988), symbolising a space where backpackers can ‘order their identities and the way they want to be identified’ (Hetherington, 1998: 107). While configured in imaginaries (movies, fiction) as representational spaces, for those backpackers over a long journey, such proper places seek to control performances by seeking to impose commodified practices under the guide of participatory programmes (group BBQ’s, dinners, pub crawls), exercise control over their reflective agency and growing knowledge. As backpackers spend time in the scapes, they will seek to re-write their spatiality and subjectivity by deploying tactics, avoiding officially permitted carnivalesque enclaves and continuous exposure spaces they believe impose upon their autonomy.

6.8 Chapter Summary.

Rather than the study of boring things, I have argued that the study of systems, spaces and infrastructure is a central aspect of the scapes, describing how the countercultural desire and imagination over-wrote reality, bringing the drift east into material and social reality. The scapes, valued for both their ‘real’ and ‘imagined’ values has seen many individuals leave home, responding to this collective imagination only to enter a social and material world where objects, places, spaces, systems have been appropriated or converted into a resource and ordered for backpacker use. Vital in the reproduction of backpacking, they act upon the individual as much as the individual acts upon them. This chapter concentrated on social spaces such as hostels and enclaves, since they are the outcome of an ongoing process of construction and adjustment between various actors and logic of the scapes and remain a vital avenue for research. While an important determinant of movement and identity, caught up in the active construction of a biographical self in the context of a fluid and complex scapes, they are not the sole determinants, since the scapes offer contradictions and paradoxes.
Chapter Seven: Habitus and the Performance of Backpacking.
7.1 Introduction.

Pierre Bourdieu, Erving Goffman and Michel de Certeau emerge from the data, writing and interpretation, the bricolage enabling me to ground this chapter in the concepts of habitus, field position, stance, tactics, strategies and (sub)cultural capital, a means to expand our understanding of backpacking beyond the limitations of fixed typologies, imagined worlds (communities) too complex to be serviced by dualisms from the first modernity (Lash, 2003). I have argued that the concept of (traveller)scapes offer a mosaic of value, opportunity and constraint; a lived and symbolic space that reflects a particular logic or ‘game’, one that I have associated with Bourdieu’s concept of field, a domain wherein (sub)cultural capital can be sought, accumulated and communicated. This (sub)cultural capital is ‘acquired by means of a sort of withdrawal from economic necessity’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 54) as individuals play the ‘game’ and purposefully adhere to the logic of the scapes, the practice of ‘doing backpacking’ and ‘being’ a backpacker improvisatory and corporeal. I argue in this chapter for a backpacker habitus, incorporated and internalised (learned and shared) as a set of dispositions that generate everyday activities, the game of everyday life articulated through bodies, carried out individually but in relationship with others. Emerging from a countercultural imagination, participation in this imagined world (community) demands individuals position the scapes around them, their lives over time becoming informed by their past in the scapes, underpinning future actions. I suggest this is a subjective habitus, socialised into over time in the scapes as a ‘second birth’ wherein backpackers in paying competent attention to a role enables the ‘doing’ of backpacking, dispositions coming to highlight their competencies, skills and knowledge, their improvisation and reflexive working helping individuals to get in touch with the scapes, embodied participation meaning the scapes can become deeply felt.

7.2 Reflexivity and deterritorialisation.

Bourdieu in his theory of practice, uses the concepts of field and habitus to display the structuring of patterns of everyday life, the practical actions informed by internalised dispositions of a ‘pre-logical’ habitus combined with a social field, arguing that there was no need for EM fieldwork given that the habitus comprises the whole, overall character of an individual or social class. For Bourdieu, it was not possible for those not socialised into a given culture to enter, given their lack of requisite cultural capital, which Bourdieu likened to genetic endowment that conditioned bodily movement, tastes and judgment. The opposition between Garfinkel (and de Certeau) and Bourdieu is founded on a difference in
their conception of practice, a difference represented by their respective notions of member and habitus, with Garfinkel interfering a social status which ‘implies the mastery of the natural language of a given social group, and more generally, the tacit mastery of its ethnomethods’ (Coulon, 1995: 72). Bourdieu did not appreciate that EM emphasised the lay and professional construction of the member’s social world through mastering the language of that world and sought to argue that practices escaped the consciousness of the social actor, providing little room for reflexivity and agency.

The opposition between EM and Bourdieu’s theory of practice is based on Bourdieu’s rejection of the rational, calculative, practical and reflexive aspects of human nature (Mouzelis, 2008), not acknowledging the degree of rational calculation and the reflexivity involved in social games. Michel de Certeau and Ajun Appadurai argue the habitus is read as overly structured and deterministic, assuming the inability of people to resist the determination of force in a cultural system. I along with others argue that his theory should be broadened, since modern life is characterised by reflexive forms of action and larger scale (global) imagined worlds, developments in communications, transport and the media meaning these worlds exist beyond the nation state (Calhoun, 1993; Stahl, 2003; Throop and Murphy, 2002). Beck (1994: 174) notes that ‘the more societies are modernized, the more agents (subjects) acquire the ability to reflect on the social conditions of their existence and to change them accordingly’, the decline in block identities meaning agency is progressively ‘freed’ from structure (Adkins, 2004), the habitus ‘no longer simply a realm of reproducible practices and dispositions’ (Appadurai, 1996: 44), instead becoming ‘an arena for conscious choice, justification, and representation’ (ibid, 44). I argue that most of us change our habitus more than once and may end up transiting across several habituses in the course of a single lifetime (Adkins, 2004; Waterson, 2005), where in a ‘reticular world’, a stable habitus is not desirable but, rather ‘the grand person is the one who is able to link different domains and fields to one another, and to distance oneself from one’s own environment and immediate circle of relations’ (Albertsen and Diken, 2001). I argue the nation-state no longer able to contain the profusion of worlds that exist within, across and between its borders, with new kinds of yet unimagined social worlds waiting to emerge, the lifetime stability implied by Bourdieu devoured by a space-time compression that is revolutionising ‘the objective qualities of space and time [so] that we are forced to alter … how we represent ourselves to the world’ (Harvey, 1989: 240).

Using Bourdieu’s theory of practice as a heuristic structuring device, I seek to account for
the reflexive aspects of social action within backpacking, to describe a temporary reflexive (western) backpacker habitus (Sweetman, 2003; Mouzellis, 2008) by drawing on Goffman and de Certeau and specific practices, observations and performances. I argue that that the discursive practices of backpackers are generated by a subjective socialisation, one where individuals strive ‘to establish this habitus voluntarily’ (Husserl, 1997 [1948]: 123). This conception of a temporary habitus has seen increasing use in recent years, applied to social movements (peace, environmental, health) and socio-spatial lifestyles such as Ballet Dancers (Wainwright et al, 2007), Adventure Racers (Kay and Laberge, 2002), Gypsy/Travellers (Drakakis-Smith, 2007), Salsa dancers (Urquía, 2005), Boxers (Wacquant, 2004) and Skateboarders (Atencio et al, 2009) as well as professions such as City Builders (Friedmann, 2005) and Junior Doctors (Luke, 2003). Requiring sufficient desire, motivation, involvement and action, these habituses can structure the everyday through time-space, the transnational immigrant habitus (Kelly and Lusis, 2006), the New Age Traveller habitus (Scott and Street, 2000), graffiti artists in New York (Cresswell, 1996), like backpackers generating sets of dispositions through a symbiotic relationship with embodied mobility in imagined worlds, their socialities and spatilities of practice giving rise to the possibility of new ways of being in the world as individuals actively instruct one another over time-space, verbally through spatial stories as well as micro-situations and performative cues (performative practice). Such socialisation through inter-subjective movement can bring about shared ‘collective feelings and orientation to action’ (Callaghan, 2005), generating a ‘logic of practice’ that produces and reproduces particular worlds.

7.3 The (western) Backpacker Habitus.

As individuals become displaced, they don’t do so without having some knowledge of the world they are entering, the positions and practices within it, relying ‘on a discourse on contemporary identities that is complex and may not be wholly pre-figured, but which re-figures, constructs, constitutes’ (Crouch, 2005: 27). Given the widespread representations, stories, scripts and narrative tropes embedded within movies, television shows, blogs, magazines and one’s own social networks, the individual is aided in his or her interaction with the scapes, often interacting virtually and metaphorically within this discursive realm before any physical displacement, numerous contexts helping to make sense of doing and being in this world. It means taking up the backpacker role-position and its normative expectations, positioning oneself so as to share this world with others, by finding, seeking and falling within its grasp.
That is not to say that all those who enter the field are socialised into carrying the habitus, with many failing to engage in a ‘learning trajectory’, many unable to free themselves from subjective and objective demands on their time, unable to withdraw from economic necessity. Bourdieu suggests that participation in a field is based on an interest in and an understanding of the game, where there is tacit agreement about the game, where the player needs ‘to participate, to admit that the game is worth playing and that the stakes that are created in and through this fact are worth pursuing’ (Bourdieu, 1998: 77). Bourdieu (1991: 8) argues this illusio125 implies, on the one hand, ‘an investment in the game as such, the inclination to play the game (instead of leaving it, or of losing interest in it)’ and implies: ‘a “feel” for the game, a sense of the game mastered in the practical form of an embodied principle of relevance’. Rather than a by-product of a middle class habitus, displacement is often accompanied by the rejection or destabilisation of previous codes, normal routines, structures and priorities as they enter a different world and adjust to ‘new rhythms and rituals’ (Clifford, 1992: 106). Like the industrial worker, the backpacker ‘converts his whole body into the automatic, specialised implement of that operation’ (Marx, 1965: 339), manifesting itself in styles of taking up space, individual desire meeting the conventions surrounding backpacker discourse. This illusio has two parts, the first being ‘inclination’ which refers to the tacit adherence of individual members of a field to the stakes and the rules of the field while ‘ability’ refers to the ‘feel for the game’ that allows competent individuals to distinguish between interesting and important things, objects, places and events.

Crossley (2004) argues that when individuals ‘believe in the game’ and attune to it, they unconsciously censor and sublimate their expressions to conform to the requirements of the scapes, assuming its values and ideals. This socialised subjectivity is described by Pierre Bourdieu as a habitus, a term derived from the Latin for ‘habitual or typical condition’, an old philosophical notion, originating in the thought of Aristotle and of the medieval scholastics (Wacquant, 2006). Defined by Bourdieu (1977: 95) as ‘an acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted’, ‘systems of durable, transposable dispositions’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 72) that ‘functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions’

125 That is not to say that backpackers do not carry habits, routines and dispositional traces with them from belonging to and participating in other imagined worlds (communities).
(Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 18), generating and organising practices, representations and actions ‘consistent with those conditions’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 95). The western backpacker habitus provides its carrier with a sense of one’s (and others) place, operating in relation to the scapes, ensuring backpackers are more disposed to act in some ways more than others as they learn (consciously and unconsciously) new skills, competencies and (sub-cultural) knowledge, internalising the habitus as a set of dispositions, know-how (rather than rules). It is internalised as ‘second nature’, ‘second sense’, ‘practical logic’, ‘practical reason’ or ‘practical intuition’ and implies a bodily, reflexive ‘know how’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Bourdieu (2000: 143) argues that once carried, individuals are ‘caught up in it, bond up with it … like a garment … or a familiar habitat … at home in the world because the world is also in him, in the form of habitus’. Bourdieu (1977: 214; original emphasis) maintains that the ‘word disposition seems particularly suited to express what is covered by the concept of habitus’, since they dispose its carrier to specific ways of perceiving, conceiving, reasoning and acting, so that it also ‘designates a way of being, a habitual state (especially of the body) and, in particular, a predisposition, tendency, propensity or inclination’ (ibid, 214) manifested in bodily skills, styles, tastes and other discursive knowledge. Operating below the level of a written ideology, the habitus furnishes ‘a tacit knowledge of how to ‘go on’ without saying’ as a competent social agent, producing very diverse practices at various stagings (places, institutions, events). The habitus makes it possible to ‘produce an infinite number of practices that are relatively unpredictable (like the corresponding situations) but also limited in their diversity’ (Bourdieu, 1990a: 55) and rather than isolated, intentional acts, they should be seen as a ‘continuous flows of conduct, which are always future-oriented’ (Simonsen, 2001: 45), always submitting to the habitus and therefore the reproduction of the scapes. Therefore, what is produced through the habitus in terms of practices and routinised bodily performances is not merely a passive replica of an ideology or a guidebook but rather, a manifestation of a generative set of dispositions, individually and collectively performed, socially situated in the scapes and oriented towards the accumulation of capital and the construction of a sense of place.

The (western) backpacker habitus is a product of history, a field / game whose logic is passed on from the counterculture, a way of life maintained around specific principles, its fundamental truths set by the historically and socially situated conditions of its production, which continue to set the regularities of the scapes. In the fractious days of the mid to late 60’s, individuals searched for a ‘sense of place’ within a society in flux, with many young people of bourgeois origin abandoning ‘taken-for-granted’ orientations and the spatial
constraints of their habitus ‘to adopt more reflexive, calculating modes of operation’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 131). Bourdieu (2000) uses the term ‘hysteresis’ to designate the mismatch between habitus and field in times of crisis and rapid change in social conditions, although Bourdieu believes they are ‘very exceptional and, in most cases, provisional’ (Bourdieu, 2005a: 47). In North America and Western Europe, a rapidly changing society saw many convert to radical politics and alternative lifestyles. The convergence of youth culture, affluence and increased access to university education at the same time as a crisis in the educational, political, social, cultural fields (anti-Vietnam War Protests, Paris Uprising) nurtured imaginings of a better life, the failure of the counterculture to offer an alternative political reality after 1967-1968 leading individuals to turning away (and dropping out) from their societies to seek salvation elsewhere. Like Bourdieu's 'pure' writer or artist, the scapes came to represent freedom when constructed against block identities and state institutions, and while today, the scapes are not a straightforward reproduction given their dynamic character, individuals still respond to this world and what it offers.

I do not want to give the impression that socialisation is linear since it requires a work-like character, people unable to ‘simply and mechanistically develop a habitus from knowledge of the social field’ (Luke, 2003: 66). It involves the acquisition of competences, knowledge and skills that require effort and time, mobility leading to encounters and experiences they can internalise as new knowledge. The socialisation process is both an inner and outer journey; the dispositions organising life for individuals, linking them to other backpackers since it gives them a sense of common fate, of being in the same boat, helping individuals to locate themselves in relation to others in ‘in stable networks of relationships, objects and spaces, producing collective assumptions and unreflexive orientations’ (Edensor, 2006: 532). A habitus creates a ‘sense of one's place’ but also a ‘sense of the other's place’ as they continuously engage in making sense or meaning of their own and others actions. While backpackers are often in disagreement, ‘with competing notions about what actions are ‘appropriate’, ‘competent’ and ‘normal’ (Edensor, 2006a), ‘individuals have to work hard to prove their lifestyles to be consistent and legitimate in the eyes of relevant others’ (Spaargaren, 2006) as ‘we are always being evaluated; our very being is absorbed into the ways in which others look at us: at every moment and in every way we may fail the test of the scrutinizing and judgemental world’ (Morgan and Pritchard, 2005b: 115).
7.3.1 The Habitus and the Travellerscapes.

While Bourdieu’s world-view did not accept that nation-state’s were facing unique challenges in providing overarching meanings for individuals (Kim, 2003), I argue that many individuals can now search and choose among a great variety of imagined worlds (communities), each a game characterised by their own doxa and form of valued capital. The twin concepts of ‘habitus’ and ‘scapes’ ‘stick together’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992), maintaining a ‘relationship of mutual attraction’ (Bourdieu, 1999: 512) since the habitus is grounded in the social circumstances or ‘field’ from which it emerges. Pierre Bourdieu’s formula for studying social practice was written as ‘[(habitus) (capital)] field = practice’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 101), and therefore we can only understand the backpacker habitus in relation to the scapes (social field), which stands in a dialectic relationship and ‘ontological correspondence’ whereby the field constructs and shapes the habitus. The habitus also constructs the field by endowing it with ‘meaning’, ‘sense’ and ‘value’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992; Reay, 1997) through its determination by backpackers’ appreciation and consumption of capital. This habitus will only thrive in the scapes, understood as producing the dispositions necessary for traversing them. When an individual leaves the scapes boundaries, the habitus will lack context and its carriers will feel ‘out of place’ and often resistance, their learned competencies less useful, their dispositions toned down, or even completely disappearing if they are not intermittently actualised (Lahire, 2003). Given the habitus is not supported in specific environments, returning to the tourismscapes wearing old ragged clothes or attempts at bargaining might lead to refused entry, the habitus making a competent and skilled actor in the social milieu into which one is socialised, less so in other social milieus (Korp, 2008).

7.3.2 Habitus and (Sub)cultural Capital.

I argue that as backpackers become anchored within the scapes, distributed (sub)cultural capital (Thornton, 1996, 1997) must be accumulated and embodied, being able to ‘know’ and ‘appreciate’ and communicate what constitutes value becomes important for recognition and distinction. Any claim for a new subjectivity is partly derived from how individuals identify, perceive, appreciate and accumulate capital and is allays an ‘unfinished’ business, conferring status on its owner in the eyes of the relevant beholder, affecting standing in the field. The practices we associate with backpacking are generated from relations between one’s dispositions (habitus) and one’s position in the field (capital),

126 The formula is also written as ‘(Habitus x Capital) + Field = Practice’. 
but also depend on the current state of play of that social arena (field) (Maton, 2008). Adapted from the term cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977), (sub)cultural capital provides a means to understand how the scapes are structured as coherent, and signaling the cultural characteristics required to be recognised as a participant of this world.

The concept of cultural capital is described as ‘scarce symbolic goods, skills and titles’ (Wacquant, 1998: 221) and was developed by Bourdieu, in conjunction with economic and social capital, which could be applied ‘to all the goods material and symbolic, without distinction, that present themselves as rare and worthy of being sought after in a particular social formation’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 178; original emphasis). Acting as a social relation within a system of exchange, it includes ‘accumulated cultural knowledge that confers power and status’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 243). While Bourdieu looked to forms of cultural capital valued by a society, capital that could be readily convertible to other forms of capital, the scapes which cut across, between and within societies are structured by the distribution of (sub)cultural capital which must be accumulated and which ‘represents the immanent structure of the social world, ie, the set of constraints, inscribed in the very reality of that world, which govern its functioning in a durable way, determining the chances of success for practices’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 242). This capital, its accumulation, embodiment and communication is a by-product of individual activity and labour, establishing a hierarchy through which adherence to the logic of the scapes are policed. While (sub)cultural capital exists in three forms (embodied, objectified and institutionalised), backpackers largely seek to attain objectified and embodied capital which is encapsulated within the temporal, social and spatial context of the scapes, capital that might encompass general cultural awareness to (sub)cultural knowledge, all of which must be continually communicated. Since the scapes are always in a process of becoming, it is a space of conflict and competition; backpackers struggling to establish control over and access to specific capital, an asset that represents the product of accumulated labour and especially time. The set of dispositions backpackers acquire depend on 'their particular endowment in capital' (Wacquant, 1998: 221), hierarchial positions ‘characterised by the volume and type of capital it has access to’ (Peillon, 1998: 216) with those who can have the appropriating capacities, accumulating and mobilising the relevant capital 'like trumps in a game of cards' (Bourdieu, 1991: 230), the right to speak and legitimacy invested in those agents ‘recognized by the field as powerful possessors of capital’ (Moi, 1991: 1022).

Objectified (sub)cultural capital is primarily connected with collecting knowledge and
places, the recalling of experiences, places and people tantamount evidence of exposure to them. The details and meanings attributed to them are woven into individual stories and narratives as part of constructing social identity. Cassou (1967: 29) notes how tourists are ‘imperiously caught up in a closed circuit of obligatory stops at places sacralized by guidebooks’, duty bound to go to a sight that has been prefigured as ‘worthwhile’ (Dann, 2003). Richards and Wilson (2004c: 28) notes how ‘backpackers feel the need to have diverse experiences if they are to be able to justify their trips’; to make the best use of their time and to ‘represent themselves as somebody who has personally experienced as much as possible’ (Binder, 2004: 106). Objectified capital can also include the accoutrements that individual’s use to publicly display their commitment and attachment to this world (backpacks, alternative guidebooks) and can include ‘bought’ experiences. Some capital accrues more ‘interest’ than others, the value of capital increasing or decreasing depending on its scarcity or abundance. This capital, while never fixed has the ‘appearances of an autonomous, coherent universe which, although the product of historical action, has its own laws, transcending individual wills’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 247), remaining symbolically and materially active, as long as it is ‘appropriated by agents and implemented and invested as a weapon and a stake in the struggles’ (ibid, 247).

The second form of (sub)cultural capital made visible in the scapes is embodied (sub)cultural capital and refers to the embodiment of (sub)cultural knowledge, specific competencies and skills, accumulated so as to be seen and recognised as a competent, legitimate, credible and relevant member of this world. Its incorporation costs time rather than money but ‘which must be invested personally by the investor’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 224), its acquisition meaning ‘work on oneself’ (self-improvement), an effort that presupposes a personal cost, energy and sacrifice. It is a form of capital accumulated unconsciously and bodily, converted into an integral part of the individual’s conscious reflection. While objectified capital is about performing identity, embodied capital is about expressing who you are, behaving ‘naturally’ and ‘being themselves’ (Meyrowitz, 1985: 320) rather than continually performing for others. This form of capital can take the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind (to believe) and body (to act) and only comes with the capacity for reflexive negotiation and distance from the centrality. This ‘reflexivity’ becomes mediated through the habitus, allowing individuals to distance themselves from the role so as to appropriate scarce capital that can be used to present a desirable image, even if such
accumulation is risky and demanding. It is through mobility and encountering friction\textsuperscript{127} that one accumulates embodied capital and only be brought about by the individual. Not easily learned or communicated, since it is ‘something that one is’ (Bourdieu, 1990a: 73), this capital that enables an individual ‘to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 122). It accumulation over time may lead them to abandon, adapt or rewrite previously accumulated objectified capital if such capital is perceived to be incompatible to one’s developing mastery. Such capital then when combined (objectified and embodied) can be called ‘road status’ (Sørensen, 2003).

7.3.3 Habitus and the Body.

The embodied body is central to backpacking, given that as well as regulating access to the scapes, individuals ‘learn bodily’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 141), appropriating the scapes logic like character to play in the context of a given social field (Butler, 1997), serving as a medium for individual bodies to ‘belong’ to space. Since ‘[p]ractical immersion in the interactions of day-to-day life is an essential part of the sustaining of a coherent sense of identity’ (Giddens, 1991: 99), an individual must become bodily ‘exposed to the world’ and ‘capable of being conditioned by the world’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 134). Even before the journey the body is made fit-for-purpose as scripted activities help to augment mobility. From vaccinations (to make the body more tolerant against diseases / viruses that may immobilise them), travel insurance to first-aid kits, embodied expressions of backpacker consciousness are incorporated, performed and rendered through the body. From ways of moving, looking, feeling, speaking, dressing and gesturing, bodily performances are enacted consciously and unconsciously as participants put their bodies in the line and draw a line with their bodies within the boundaries of the scapes.

The hippies created a carefully crafted look with second hand clothes, long hair and beads that highlighted their countercultural identity in defiance to the culture of conformity (Mills, 1973), their clothes symbolic of the routines and lives they left behind\textsuperscript{128} (Teas, 1988 [1974]) (and evidence of the places, cultures and people they encountered). Neville (1970: 10) describes how the drifters wore ‘Arabian headdresses, Indian sandals and beads, Nepalese earings, a Thai Buddhist shoulder bag, an Afghanistan embroidered leather coat.

\textsuperscript{127} Similarly, Sørensen (2003: 856) summarises the perception the typical backpacker had of his or her own experience: ‘In total, [being a backpacker] comprises hardship, experience, competence, cheap travel, along with the ability to communicate it properly’.

\textsuperscript{128} As Bourdieu (1984: 57) argues, aesthetic stances in clothing ‘are opportunities to experience or assert one’s position in social space, as a rank to be upheld or a distance to be kept’.
and blue jeans\(^{129}\), their bodily desires constitutive of their self-identity and the ways they imagined themselves. Constructing ‘authenticity’ every step of the way (Shaffer, 2004), they embody the world they inhabited, including its edginess, roughness and risk. From hepatitis, tattoos, piercings, beards, long hair, styles of dress and malnourishment, bodies were made visible and expressive, losing themselves to the scapes, and letting the scapes do this to their bodies. Those starting their journey in the 60s met others who were returning; ‘the battle-weary veterans trudging by, the fresh, eager troops marching briskly along. On one side of the road, the healthy, with their money, passports and jeans; on the other, the skinny, the strung out, the sick, the poor…But they were smiling’ (Tomory, 1996: 50-1). Bourdieu (2000: 141) argues that ‘in the sense of belonging to the world, being possessed by it…measurable by their duration, intensity, etc. – of the bodily modifications that result from it’; their bodies revealing ‘the deepest dispositions of the habitus’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 190).

While less a drifter ‘uniform’, the backpacker body still reflects the scapes over time, the body still acting as a medium to fashion the self and remaining an expressive space, the exposure to peoples, places and cultures meaning the ‘practical and fleshy body’ is continually subject to the determinants of that space and is produced by space. From the energy that is deployed and put to use there’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 195), corporal transformation is ‘impressed through bodily experiences (Bourdieu, 1984: 77), where ‘[b]eyond the trial of physical endurance and mental strength lies the promise of a more confident self’ (Edensor, 2001: 93). Sennett (1994: 310) notes how the ‘body comes to life when coping with difficulty’, the more exposure to challenges, pain, tiredness, nuisances, obstacles that unbuckle and unleash the body, the more connected they feel to this world. In other words, ‘if there is any truth, it is the truth of the body’ (Game, 1991: 192), ‘self-powered’ performances in particular more ‘real’ than those could be accomplished by the passive and risk adverse tourist, who don’t have the time, stamina or bodily / physical competence or skill to take on the hikes, all night parties, lack of hygiene and insecurity. Their bodily dispositions are part of ‘the feel for the game, and the game itself’ (Bourdieu, 1999: 151) and without the ‘right’ bodily dispositions one cannot confront and succumb to the field, its exposure necessary in the production of subjectivities and the accumulation of capital, ‘one’s body or speech, is in fact very closely linked to the position occupied in social space’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 206).

\(^{129}\) Mills (1973: 2-3) described hippie / drifters wearing similar garb.
While there is much debate about the Bourdieuan habitus: whether it is essentially static or whether its properties can change dynamically with different conditions and circumstances (Hiller and Rooksby, 2005), I argue that the backpacker habitus is not made up of a rule-bound, non-conscious, pre-programmed role. I argue that in a dynamic field of behaviour, position-taking emerges where individual's seek to command access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, the field presenting itself, 'as a structure of possibilities – of rewards, gains, profits, or sanctions – but always implies a measure of indeterminacy' (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 18). I argue there is a breath and depth in the backpacker habitus, becoming modified and reinforced by capital linked to continual involvement, a continuum that exists between strategic and tactical positions.

7.4 The Strategic Backpacker Habitus (position).

Few backpackers take up the role without some belief, knowledge or motivation to pursue its goals, no backpacker finding the principles, values associated with and surrounding backpacking totally unfamiliar, incomprehensible or irrational as they perform their desire across time and space, 'through which aspects of both their identity and identifications are concurrently constructed, transformed and expressed' (Malbon, 1999: 29). Few start their journey fully armed with knowledge and know-how about the state of play, 'the positions, beliefs and aptitudes of other actors, or the full consequences of their actions’ (Malton, 2008) and the value of its stakes. Individuals in the early stages of the trip are often unsure and are drawn to the people (and familiar bodies) they believe are proximate to themselves, initially seeking encounters and interactions with other backpackers. Finding ‘the other within range’ (Goffman, 1963), the ‘individual’s initial projection commits him to what he is proposing to be and requires him to drop all pretences of being other things’ (Goffman, 1969a: 22) as they learn (re-embed) new constructions of understanding, where individuals ‘learn not just about commodities and their uses and meanings, but also about styles of self-presentation, bodily techniques of expression, and associated notions of competency or even expertise’ (Malbon, 1999: 27).

As well as relying heavily on other backpackers, they also rely on objects, institutions, guidebooks; clinging to the world to which they have been presented, trading self-expression for the benefits of consistency, reliability and what Giddens calls ‘ontological security’ (1991: 35–69). Seeking ‘shared but special’ information, they consciously and
beyond consciously correct the ‘first movements’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 163) by seeking to perform to the role and it’s performative conventions. A reflexive monitoring restricts the scope for exploration, as they seek validated elements and signifiers, the centre of the scapes offering a point of reference, complete with like minded others and signs of backpacking from hostels, English language staff, western food to connectivity, where the most basic acquired skills, knowledge and narratives can be applied or tested through a continual self-presentation. To embrace a role is to be embraced by it’ (Goffman, 1961: 106), where we ‘draw ourselves closer to valued objects and resources that we use to engage others – to impress, to befriend, or simply to play’ (Holt, 1995: 15), where harmonised practices, however trite or symbolic (speech, clothes) require individuals to show themselves and others that they are committed to playing the game.

They make rational strategic choices rooted in the conscious and less-than-conscious ‘practical logic’ with respect to the variability of circumstances, allowing them to be able to predict, to run ahead of time by reading and mapping patterns of practice and mobility. A strategic stance enables individuals to centre themselves within the scapes uneven, edged and blurred boundaries, its centre generally discernible along mapped networks of mobility, with Williams et al, (2004: 100) noting at their centre, the scapes flow, for ‘it is usually faster, cheaper – and perhaps, easier and safer – to move through than outside them’. This not a wholly uncomfortable process since it introduces individuals to (discursive) practices and familiar others, where other backpackers, products, services and objects surround the individual, backpacking visibly consumerable, happenable and performable. Businesses capitalise on this role embracement by supplying credible objects of satisfaction, alluring and trustworthy enough ‘to prompt effort which ‘make sense’ and ‘give sense’ to their time travelling (Bauman, 2001: 3). Unpredictability is diminished through ‘imaginary orders that constitute people’s self-projects’ (Glennie and Thrift, 1996: 235), ‘spaces of representation’ (Lefebvre, 1991a) both enabling and constraining in equal measure. As individuals anchor themselves into its imaginary and lived centre, the presence of other backpackers confirms they are in the right places and doing the right kind of things, even if that means overlooking errors, missed cues\(^\text{130}\) and inappropriate behaviour (Goffman, 1969a).

Individuals possess their autonomy ‘by virtue of their prior mutual recognition of one another’ (Rehg, 1994: 121: 109), their reliance and recognition of fellow travellers ‘elements

\(^\text{130}\) Kelly (1997: 405) notes that ‘[w]e negotiate, sometimes skillfully and sometimes awkwardly, to carry out lines of action in real and often powerful social contexts’.\end{footnotesize}
of a common world’ (Berger and Pullberg, 1965: 199) making sense since the scapes are ‘confirmed and re-confirmed by others’ (Berger and Pullberg, 1965: 201). Goffman (1969a: 223) notes how the ‘whole machinery of self-production’ is dependent on others; the strategic stance demanding one performs socially produced space with others. As one becomes socialised, there is as Binder (2004: 98-99), points out an ‘ease with which one can approach new people is based on the common knowledge that everyone is eager to form groups to share fun, costs, risks and experiences’, their proximity and sociation (the mobility of bodies) combining in space and time to produce an ‘existential insideness’ – a feeling of belonging within the rhythm of life-on-space’ (Cresswell, 2003: 277), the presence of others psychologically comforting as the social body is created through a relationship with bodies recognised as friendly (Simonsen, 2004).

This is an unlinear process that can generate inappropriate or misplaced behaviours, being and doing backpacking always a unsteady, temporal process (Crouch, 2005) as individuals externalise themselves through interactional encounters with places, situations, objects, things, and people. It is a process that must be presented and recognised successfully to themselves and others, their sense of self stabilising over a substantial period of time, leading to a habitus that becomes durable, an aggregate of dispositions acquired as an embodied reality and a taken for granted world becoming one. This strategic position provides individuals with a sense of direction as they continually seek to accumulate, secure and embody (sub)cultural capital in a potentially volatile and changing field, their belonging continually at risk and therefore continually monitored and worked upon. Over time, the habitus and the scapes (field) fit, becoming normalised and unremarkable, providing for a sense of control and security. Webb et al, (2002: 38-39) argue that for a particular habitus to function smoothly and effectively, ‘individuals must normally think that the possibilities from which they choose are in fact necessities, common sense, natural or inevitable’, while other possibilities are ruled out precisely because they are unthinkable. The strategic habitus, the result of the internalisation of external structures, reacts to ‘the solicitations of the field in a roughly coherent and systematic manner’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 18) but is not just simply about following the ‘rules’ but having a ‘sense’ of the game and a sense of how to play, instilling ‘a sense of one’s place’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 466). The scapes ‘everydayness’ becomes unreflexive, routinised sequences of movement that reinforce notions about what ‘constitutes the common-sense and the unquestioned’ strengthening ‘affective and cognitive links’ and consolidating ‘a sense of shared natural habits and doxa to constitute a habitus, including acquired skills which minimise
unnecessary reflection every time a decision is required’ (Edensor, 2005: 80-81, original emphasis). Doxa describes the participant’s ‘commitment to the presuppositions’ of the game they are playing (Bourdieu, 1990a: 66) and the ‘uncontested acceptance of the daily lifeworld’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 73). This ‘tacit acceptance of the supremacy of some choices, that is, attitudes and behaviours, at the expense of others’ (Korp, 2008) becomes a ‘silent act of social domination through the tacit application of a taken-for-granted (doxic) world-view’ (ibid), given there is strong ‘doxic’ agreement about what the advantages of backpacking and what counts as the ‘right way’ to travel.

As everything becomes comprehensible within the discursive limits set by the scapes, backpackers have the ability to make the 'right' choices, 'creating the capacity to differentiate and appreciate these practices and products (taste)' (Bourdieu, 1984: 170). Their dispositions express the ‘same expressive intention in the specific logic of each of the symbolic sub-spaces’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 173), allowing for the accumulation of objectified (sub)cultural capital, the strategic stance, ‘the ongoing result of the interaction between the dispositions of the habitus and the constraints and possibilities, which are the reality of any given social field' (Jenkins, 2003: 83). Bourdieu (1995: 292) notes how the most profitable strategies ‘are usually those produced, without any calculation, and in the illusion of the most absolute ‘sincerity’, by a habitus objectively fitted to the objective structures’. Control over stagings that embody capital can be very profitable for those those in the tourism industry; backpacker hostels for example, providing individuals with confidence of ‘being-in-the-world’. Indeed the certainty, predictability of such spaces are welcomed by many travellers since everything outside these bubbles are not part of their usual performative strategies, where attempted performances can result in panic and a wish to return to ‘familiar spaces and codes’ (Edensor, 2000: 333). Edensor (2006: 45) argues it is important to acknowledge the pleasures of the familiar – a comfortable sense of place, a practical competence, and familiar sensations’. However, the scapes are not wholly over determined as each backpacker can confront circumstances by ‘reflecting upon themselves in relation to their circumstances and vice versa’ (Archer, 2007: 42). While initially, the backpacker might be ‘following of scripts, or the acting out of codes’ (Szerszynski et al, 2003: 3), backpackers over time will seek to play the scapes as game rather thas consume it as a field. As they are exposed to encounters over time-space, individuals gain knowledge about the size and depth of the scapes, a ‘reality’ that strategeic backpackers rarely see, since they lack the accumulated capital that represents an individual ‘wealth of knowledge’ (Bourdieu, 1997). Many backpackers will return home before they become
reflexive about the role and the scapes, lack of time or mobility often denying them knowledge about the depth, size or limits of the scapes. Hottola (2008: 35) notes how backpackers know ‘when the limits of their individually variable learning capabilities’ have been reached and draw back to the safety of ‘in-group status’ where the world remains real, ‘in the sense of subjective plausibility and consistency’ (Berger and Pullberg, 1965: 201). For many, the strategic position implies a ‘tacit acceptance of one’s position, a sense of limits…..to be marked and maintained, respected, and expected of other’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 235).

While socialisation is done with others, in the end, individuals are often thwarted, conflicted and thrown into contingencies by obstacles; forced ‘to see and think without the support of a whole world of known sights, sounds, and smells’ (Tuan, 1977: 146). Exposure to the scapes interrupts any adherence to scripts, the habitus soon demanding reactive, spontaneous actions as ‘[p]erformance is the manifestation of agency’ and so ‘[p]erformance is thus ephemeral, unpredictable, improvisatory, always contingent on its context’ (Szerszynski et al, 2003: 3). This improvisation is often ‘significantly in excess of prefigured meanings, frameworks of consumption and the anticipated realization’ (Crouch, 2006: 362), ‘always contingent, subject to re-enactments in different conditions, and unpredictable uptake’ (Jaworski and Thurlow, 2009). Contestation against the collective tenet and what is ‘proper’ and ‘appropriate’ in a given setting is widespread as fleeting / temporary contestations is a means to break the rules ‘safely’ with Goffman (1967: 40) noting how revolts that transgress the ritual code can be used by anyone ‘who upholds it too eagerly or not eagerly enough, in terms of the standards and expectations of his group’. However as the habitus and field fully function in relation to which other, ‘it is likely that those who are ‘in their right place’ in the social world can abandon or entrust themselves more, and more completely, to their dispositions ….. than those who occupy awkward positions’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 163), embodied capital giving them the confidence to go beyond the demands, constraints and opportunities set by externalities in the scapes. Individuals will seek to self-fashion themselves to appear more self-managed in a process of role distance that might lead them to do things, stay in places, talk to people and engage in practices that might have been unanticipated at the outset of their travels. As confidence and skills grow, backpackers come to resent the partial control they can exert in the centre of the scapes, a restricted reality within the dominant reality that is adept at protecting performances, shielding backpackers physically and psychologically from disruption of routinised bodily performances (Hottola, 2004). Bourdieu (2000: 14) notes that:
It is only because the body is ‘exposed and endangered in the world, faced with the risk of emotion, lesion, suffering, sometimes death, and therefore obliged to take the world seriously (and nothing is more serious than emotion, which touches the depths of our organic being) that it is able to acquire dispositions that are themselves an openness to the world.

This accumulation of embodied capital, and the reflexivity that comes with it is ‘conditional on our interactions - bodily, linguistic, social and imaginary - with the world in which we live, but that we are involved in a constant struggle to sustain and augment our relation in the being of others, as well as the nonbeing of the physical and material world’ (Jackson, 2005: xiv).

7.5 The Tactical ‘Backpacker’ Habitus (position).

The scapes are full of sensation, energy and movement, its fluid boundaries representing an imagined and lived world that seems given, natural, practical and inevitable to those who become socialised into it. Everything and everyone, at least in the centre of the scapes becomes comprehensible, the structured pattern of mobility providing a sense of place, enabling practices to be harmonised within varying situations and contexts. However, I argue there is enough practice-based evidence to utilise and develop Bourdieu’s notion of habitus in combination with Michel de Certeau’s description of everyday practice and Evring Goffman’s role continuum to describe a ‘tactical backpacker habitus’ (position). If the strategic habitus carrier attains a ‘feel for the game’, they do so by colonising a visible and specific (proper) space designed and regulated for them in mind. I argue, that through mobility, one develops the capacity to be reflexive about the scapes and one’s role, where reflexivity and distance from that role is mediated through the habitus as a form of embodied (sub)cultural capital. Those starting their trip are not able to take up a tactical stance given the ‘potential agent first learns to act on rules imposed on him by others’ (Pinkard, 2002: 188; original emphasis), ‘others legislating for him and only gradually grow into the role of autonomous co-legislator’ (ibid, 188), a situation that inclines them to initially accept the social world as it is, to take it for granted (Wacquant, 1998). Indeed, some authors like Cohen (2004) argue backpackers will remain in this position, ‘which enables them to pursue similar hedonistic enjoyment, experimentation and self-fulfillment under relatively simple (and affordable) circumstances’ (Cohen, 2004: 102), arguing there is a limited range of options and choices available to them outside the centre of the scapes. Bruner (1991: 247 cited in Shaffer, 2004: 142) argues that ‘once the tourist infrastructure is
in place, the traveller can hardly avoid the well-trodden path’ while Wilson and Richards (2008: 199) argue that even though ‘many may wish to leave the leisure of the enclave and get down to some real cultural work outside, the ability to escape an increasingly institutionalised system is limited. Travellers are led by the Lonely Planet and other guidebooks and web-sites to locations where other backpackers congregate’. I agree that those who carry a strategic habitus are dependent on the certainty of mapping, signs and markers, the pleasure of movement and the accumulation of objectified capital fusing with the sociality of collectivity and the lure of a collective identity, which can overwhelm and transcend individual subjectivity.

While strategy is the victory of convenience, rationality and the imposition of power through the disciplining and organisation of space, tactics are the ‘ruses’ that ‘take the disposition of the world and make it over …convert[ing] it to the purpose of ordinary people’ (Crang, 2000: 137). Related to Goffman’s (1961) role continuum, the tactical carrier displays ‘role distance’, a distance that requires skill, competencies and knowledge to renegotiate the scapes and their place in it, the ‘struggle for being… a course steered between a variable environment and the equally variable capacities of persons’ (Jackson, 2005: xi). While strategic backpackers are acted upon strategically, ‘the horizon does not merely close off the landscape; it opens it up for further exploration, that is, for bodily ingression’ (Casey, 2001: 690). While roles ‘reflect norms, attitudes, contextual demands, negotiation’ (Biddle, 1986: 71), the ‘evolving definition of the situation as understood by the actors’ (ibid, 71) can see individuals become tired of playing out the social role into which which they feel cast (Murphy, 2001), as conforming and adjusting to others becomes strenuous and repetitive. Disinvesting themselves of its performance, individuals will dismiss the backpacker label or any action or behaviour that could be termed touristic, collective or herd-like. Becoming cynical about the role rather than rejecting it, they aim to convey qualities new backpackers might consider risky, the creation of a more ‘genuine self’ denying ‘the virtual self implied in the role for all accepting behaviours’ (Goffman, 1961: 108). This distance, Goffman (1961: 114) asserts allows ‘one to show that something of oneself lies outside the constraints of the moment and outside the role,’ ‘actions which effectively convey some disdainful detachment of the performer from a role he is performing’ (Goffman, 1961: 110).

As subjects confront unfamiliar and problematic situations, positions of ‘possibility’ open for those who have build up the competence, skill and knowledge over time to see and exploit opportunities, using embodied capital to gain valuable resources that can advance their
position. As creative tensions between the subjective world of the ego and the given world increases, individuals will find they have a certain independence to assist themselves, so as to affirm and confirm to themselves and others, their ability to create a world of their own definition, one that idealises the fundamental truths of this field (the search for something ‘real’). De Certeau (1988: 34) acknowledges these ‘[u]nrecognized producers, poets of their own affairs, trailblazers’ who trace ‘indeterminate trajectories’ that are apparently meaningless, ‘since they do not cohere with the constructed, written, and prefabricated space through which they move’. They remain unpredictable, at odds with the dominant rationality visibly inscribed on the scapes and become adept at near constant tactical and improvisatory performances: ‘a way of doing, which is a way of knowing, in a performance’ (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998: 196).

Those who develop a tactical stance, demonstrable by undertaking shortcuts and roundabout paths – define and individualise their presence within the scapes. It is a performance that must not appear to be performance, but does not precede but follows from practice, as individuals over time-space realise the reality they live in is their own construction and it can be changed by the way they engage with it, by how they use their bodies, through their sense of time or upping the ante. Lefebvre (1991b: 136) argues the parts must be played out until the end, since ‘they are not pure roles, which an actor can give up when he is tired or when he feels he is acting badly. They extend reality, and are equally as real; acting explores what is possible… adding something extra - something real: the knowledge of a situation, an action, a result to be obtained’. For Certeau (1988: 31) such idiosyncratic trajectories ‘remain heterogeneous to the systems they infiltrate and in which they sketch out the guileful ruses of different ruses interests and desires. They circulate, come and go, overflow and drift over an imposed terrain’, using clever tricks, ruses; ‘persistent as it is is subtle, tireless, ready for every opportunity, scattered over the terrain of the dominant order and foreign to the rules laid down and imposed by rationally founded on established rights and property’. The development of human capacity for such a position involves ‘being-in-the-world through our ever changing capacity to create the conditions of viable existence and coexistence in relation to the given potentialities of our environment’ (Jackson, 2005: xv).
Like the flâneur\(^{131}\), they remove themselves linguistically, physically and socially from the social world as it is, by seeking to get as close to the real world as they can by manoeuvring to pursue desirable resources from the lowest prices to the most distinct experiences. From bargaining skills to getting ‘best value’ (Riley, 1988), their greater sense-derived knowledge, competencies and skill allow them to take short cuts. Lacking the homogeneity required by analysis; refusing the neat divisions and classifications (de Certeau, 1988), being labeled or typecast means anxiety\(^{132}\), their avoidance from ‘representations’ meaning ‘[n]ot everything shows up on the map…… the chance encounters and cross-cutting paths…the tricky and momentary ways in which people make space’ (Tonkiss, 2005: 128).

Actively resisting ‘conformist performances’ (Hannam, 2006: 244), their movement is used ‘as a tool for creativity and self-fulfillment’ (Kesselring, 2006: 270) with individuals approaching and consuming the ‘scapes’ in a different manner so as to highlight the competencies and knowledge they have built up over time. Tactics are utilised when possibilities arise, their manipulation of texts, objects and spaces produced by others, making the scapes perform for them in ways they argue represents their social world more accurately, or at least more accurately than the industry can offer or impose with hostels, guidebooks or any institution that seeks to channel or nudge them through time-space. Their fleeting victories are the victories of the weak and are often via ‘clever tricks, knowing how to get away with things, manoeuvres’ (de Certeau, 1988: xix), ‘poets of their own acts, silent discovers of their own paths in the jungle of functionalist rationality’ (de Certeau, 1988: xviii), developing their own erratic ‘trajectories’, ‘unforeseeable sentences, partly unreadable paths’ (ibid, xviii), ‘[o]ccupying the gaps or interstices of the strategic grid’ (Colebrook, 1997: 125) which ‘can corrupt or pervert the strategy’s system’ (ibid, 125).

Certeau (1988: 36-37) argues tactics ‘must play on and with a terrain imposed on it and organized by the law of a foreign power. . . . It operates in isolated actions, blow by blow. It takes advantage of ‘opportunities’ and depends on them, being without any base where it could stockpile its winnings, build up its positions and plan raids’. What it wins it cannot keep as they seek chance offerings of the moment, vigilantly making use of ‘cracks that particular conjunctions open in the surveillance of proprietary powers. It poaches them. It creates surprises in them’ (de Certeau, 1988: 37). A ‘nomadic art’ (Cresswell, 2006) they ‘circulate, come and go, overflow and drift over an imposed terrain like the snowy waves of

---

\(^{131}\) The flâneur was popularized by Walter Benjamin (1927/1999) in his infamous The Arcades Project as well as, to a lesser degree, by his analysis of the painter Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) who developed a derived meaning of flâneur—that of ‘a person who walks the city in order to experience it’. See Benjamin (1983).

\(^{132}\) A character in E.M Forster’s book Passage to India hopes to ‘slink through India unlabelled’ (Forster, 1924: 172), so as to avoid categorization.
the sea slipping in among the rocks and defiles of an established order’ (de Certeau, 1988: 34). Improvised by individuals and unknowable in advance, the scapes are worked to resist and re-appropriate the ‘strategies’ of power, the ‘institutionalized frameworks, scripts, or patterns of action that serve as general guides to behaviour’ (Carlson, 1996: 49). It is not that those with a tactical habitus oppose those with a strategic habitus, tactics instead ‘improvising upon these strategies and combining elements of them in new ways provides a continual performative ground for change, since new strategies come into being through tactical improvisation’ (Carlson, 1996: 45). These tactics are not evidence of a negative attitude since individuals ‘by thinking through what it is that causes reality to appear to be only a collection of objects and economic donnees’ (Said, 1983: 232), looking behind processes which appear eternally given and objectified, enabling them to go beyond’ empirical reality or its horizons into a putative realm of possibility’ (ibid, 232).

Those with a tactical habitus seek to hurl themselves ‘headlong into the midst of the throng’ (Baudelaire, 1970: 7), their embodied participation in activities and spaces which are typically off-limits, ‘drawing on a mobile and private language of the streets’ (Tonkiss, 2005: 128), a camouflage that can ‘be as tactical for the tourist as it is for the soldier’ (Diller and Scofidio, 1994: 24). From living amongst locals, haggling, ordering a beer in a local pub or skilfully navigating a foreign language menu, particular individual encounters can address the fear they are passive, their ability to read and consume the ‘real’, meaning like the flâneur they give themselves ecstatically to the crowd. Their ‘scrutinising, detective work, and dreaming’ (Game, 1991: 50) sets them apart from those rushing through the centre of the scapes. Bauman (2004: 31) argues that ‘[k]eeping up the speed, once an exhilarating adventure, turns into an exhausting chore. Most importantly, that nasty uncertainty and that vexing confusion, which you hoped to have shaken off thanks to your speed, refuse to go’. Even though their practices are often ‘mundane aspects of a ‘localized’ culture’ (Muzaini, 2006: 145), their behaviour at informal and heterogeneous spaces, everyday streets, markets, bars, public buses, cheap hotels and natural sites are seen as proper to the land, rather than those spaces proper to backpacking. As they avoid the 500 bed hostels or tourist landmarks, the ‘acoustic experience of the streetscape has the ability to weave individuals into the fabric of everyday life’ (Cranny-Francis, 2005: 73), mobility through ‘theoretical places’ (de Ceteau, 1988) like hostels (systems and idealising discourses) now an affront to their subjective ego. Like the flâneur attracted to the city’s dark corners

133 Sal Paradise in Kerouac’s On the Road when in Mexcio city with San Moriarty found himself amongst the poverty stricken residents, amongst the brotherls, markets, cheap resturants, music, sounds, smells and bare footed women, where ‘b*jeggars slept wrapped in
they hope for ‘the chance encounters to confront the unexpected in a kind of counter-tourism that involves a poetic physical proximity with the dispossessed and marginal, and to experience supposedly ‘real’ ‘authentic’ life ‘uncluttered’ by the dominant visual/tourist images of that place (Crawshaw and Urry, 1997: 214). The flâneur by enacting role distance and detachment seems relaxed and at ease ‘in order to ruminate upon encounters and experiences’ (Ayer, 2009: 63). Their silent protest (i.e avoiding tourist landmarks, hostels), like the flâneur demonstrates a ‘perpetual urging to check the city out and figure things out for oneself…. to rise above and escape the fesishism’ of the proper (Harvey, 2003: 56). Everyday acts (food, transport, routes, accommodation) become a re-staging on the personal level, each choice a performance for themselves and their identity, each opportunity evaluated against socially constructed versions of real travel, a negotiation of the scapes that is time consuming and tiring as they alter the way they represent the world to themselves, their dispositions to believe refuting any ‘domination of the self’.

‘Natural’ sites, objects places and services are preferred over purposely designed spaces, services and products; their consumption enacted through less privileged and ambivalent heterogeneous spaces located to serve passing trade and the local population such as small businesses and street vendors, which may ‘provide stages where transitional identities may be performed alongside the everyday enactions of residents, passers-by and workers’ (Edensor, 2001: 64). They are often weakly classified heterogeneous spaces characterised by spatial fragmentation and discontinuity, the ‘the switched-off areas [that] are culturally and spatially discontinuous’ (Castells, 2000: 33) and range from the guesthouse in Favelo’s in Rio de Janeiro, the American inner cities and the ‘French banlieues, as much as in the shanty towns of Africa or in the deprived rural areas of China or India’ (Castells, 2000: 33). From small unregistered hotels, food stalls and markets, they look ‘for the unexpected, not the extraordinary, objects and events that may open a window in structure, a chance to glimpse the real’ (Jenkins, 2003: 311), ‘ambushing’ the scapes with the aim to discover its authentic meanings even if such actions are unhygience, unsafe, irrational or illegal. Heterogeneous accommodation amongst rich and varied ‘soundscapes’ and ‘smellscapes’ (Edensor, 1998a: 62) attract individuals seeking ‘spaces that are not regulated in accordance with commercial tourism industry imperatives’,

advertising posters’ (1957: 301), Sal declared ‘[t]his was the great and final uninhibited Fellahin-childlike city that we knew we would find at the end of the road’ (Ibid). Sal was estatic, even with dysentery, finding people living in simplicity and non-materiality. In addition, in such places, the backpacker becomes a spectacle and is gazed upon.

134 Edge areas and marginal situations offer opportunities that challenge the inevitability of the commodification process. Tactical backpackers ‘hope for the construction and development of alternative social relations, which may avoid being colonised by the economic sphere’ (Maciocco, 2009: 27) and the opportunity to move, dwell and communicate without feeling manipulated.
and are rarely subject to aesthetic control or theming. They come to appreciate the
smallest aspects of living and looking like ‘locals’ even though they rarely create the
conditions to bridge boundaries to form more localised relationships. Yet, one should guard
against writing off these victories, victories won in opposition to the counting of time (Lash
and Urry, 1994) that are important in transforming their travel experience, their ability to live
in hotels that are barely inhabitable, eat food of unknown origin and stretching funds to
expand the trip simply reinforcing their subjectivity, and the intensity of the socialisation
process as they become more exposed to the scapes. Choices are not made on the basis of
rational decision-making but because they are ‘procedures that gain validity in relation to
the pertinence they lend to time – to the circumstances which the precise instant of an
intervention transforms into a favourable situation’ (De Certeau, 1988: 38).135

Their stance is seductive to others, since it is embodied in their behaviour, dress, posture
and stories, establishing a clear hierarchy, their position an expression of emancipation,
empowerment, skill, competencies and knowledge that’s unavailable in the latest
guidebook. A tactical position affords individuals a stance over others who pay ‘guidebook
price’, their competence in utilising cracks as they work through space, their skill in
exploiting ambivalence and ambiguity putting them ahead of the curve, stretching them
spatially and temporally beyond other backpackers. These fleeting victories and tactical
appropriations however temporal, superficial, imagined and shallow highlight their fluency
and ease in this world, each individual success, from a haggled price to a cheap market
meal highlighting their mastery of the scapes. These victories are clinged to by individuals
as evidence as ‘contact with the ground’ (Wylie, 2005a,b), their practices proper to the
land, the scapes folding out in front of each individual providing clarity about the self, others
and the social world. The ‘landscape no longer takes shape as a set of readily affording
surfaces for purposive and smooth motion’ (Wylie, 2005a: 244) but instead the world
contracts, time-and space decompress as they push out the scapes boundaries as they
purposely live without the convenience and speed. Seeking a ‘deeper sociality’ and a
‘complex sensuous relationality’ (Kontogeorgopoulos, 2003; Muzaini, 2006), this stance
bolsters their self-esteem by providing them with narrative potential, their stories often more
imagined as real acts of heroic everyday resistance. Within the scapes, ‘markets’ operate,
in which the tactical backpacker engages in both latent, and overt struggles to accumulate
and monopolise capital and to determine what will count as capital. It is a stance that

135 Tactics are not counter-strategy, they are ‘within’ but ‘other’, they ‘escaped it without leaving it’ (de Certeau 1988: xiii).
reveals, opens up and creates ruptures, tears and fraying, the shards of their identities always threatening to expose them, running the risk of being taken for a tourist or backpacker and sending back down the continuum, ‘revealed in those moments where people are not sure how to behave, or what people think of them, or where people feel self-conscious, or alienated’ (Pile and Thrift, 1995: 45), always balancing at the edge of competence’ (Hannerz, 1996: 105).

The return home, to a university or job means individuals move back or move into a new field where different values and norms apply, their dispositions and routinised bodily performances (clothes, eating conventions, diet) suddenly out of place, only intermittently materialising through photos albums, souvenirs and stories. Those bodily ascribed with visible capital such as a tan, weight loss, dreadlocks or beard may undergo a radical change as they return to previous eating habits, climate and routines. While likely to seek to commnicate their transformation, individuals often find little supportive reciporicy from friends and family. Indeed, these dispositions might alienate the individual from them since they can’t be successfully carried over from the scapes into another social field given the absence of others who have shared the same socialisation process; the return home often difficult and tinged with ambivalence and uncertainty (Elsrud, 2005). While those not fully investing in the game can fit back in, their ‘lightness and flightiness’ meaning they can painlessly jump back into their old skin (Meethan, 2003: 17-18), those who went through intense socialisation over a long period face difficulty, the transition back to ‘ordinary life’ difficult as newly internalised dispositions make it difficult to reintegrate, their assemblage of orientations, perceptions and appreciations out of place and only of value to the person who internalised them. Westerhausen (2002: 139) found that returning backpackers were ‘unable to relate to non-tavellers’, were ‘unhappy and wanted to return to life on the road as soon as possible’; ‘felt alienated’, and ‘could no longer make a pernament commitment to any aspect of life in the West’.

7.6 Inter-Subjective Interplay.

Where individuals commit to this world and its regualrities, they will seek to understand the scapes and construct, convey and project their belonging inter-subjectively with others, staging the self in joint action and engendering proximity from which collaboration, negotiation and co-operation emerge. Berman (1970: 141) citing Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778), notes how ‘social man knows only how to live outside himself, in the
judgments of others; indeed, it is only from the judgment of others that he gains consciousness of his very existence’. I argue what exists in this world are relations, the imagined world (community) re-establishing itself ‘with each story, representation or narration of travel experiences that is passed around’ (Binder, 2004: 99), each interaction stimulating a sense of belonging that reduces uncertainty, the scapes ‘seen not merely as an arena in which social life unfolds, but rather as a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced’ (Gregory and Urry, 1985: 3). ‘The recognition that can come from cooperative competition with others, the social world offers humans that which they most totally lack: a justification for existing’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 239), the tales, stories and bragging endowed with meaning\textsuperscript{136}, with Kim (2003: 29) noting how ‘[o]nly when self and others are co-present can people achieve clarity about self, others and the world’. These self-selecting interactions and encounters with other backpackers are an important component of backpacking (Binder, 2004; Cohen, 1973; Murphy, 2001; Riley, 1988), narrative exchange central to the continual re-production and re-creation of backpacking.

\textit{…the stories could be formulated in a special code, thus making it clear that every event is a particular application of the formal framework. But in replaying the games, in telling about them, these accounts record the rules and the moves simultaneously. To be memorized as well as memorable, they are repertoires of schemas of action between partners. With the attraction that the element of surprise introduces, these mementos teach the tactics possible within a given (social) system…. Moves, not truths are recounted…} (de Certeau, 1988: 22-23).

Through exchanges, backpackers make statements about whom they are and their position in the scapes, learning about the world and themselves, what must be believed and what must be done (de Certeau, 1988). Moreover, ‘narratives have the strange but strong power to transform seeing into believing, of fabricating realities out of appearances’ (Strüver, 2004: 68) producing and organising ‘geographies of action’ (de Certeau, 1988: 116) and thereby regulating spatial movements. Typically beginning with small talk (Goffman, 1963), how to approach strangers must be learned by those entering the scapes, interactions often intense, forming far more quickly than they would in normal life and while disipating quickly (Riley, 1988; Murphy, 2001), enabling individuals to grasp the common conditions of existence. Co-presence is necessary for those early on their journey as they seek to demonstrate and learn styles of self-presentation, bodily routines and schemes of production and interpretation as well as various competencies, skills and knowledge

\textsuperscript{136} To quote Jean-Paul Satre (1938) for ‘the most banal event to become an adventure, it is necessary and sufficient to start recounting it’. 

\textsuperscript{232}
(Malbon, 1999), situating themselves in marked places of significance so as to build, perform and test a specific narrative of self. This ‘compulsion to proximity’ (Boden and Molotch, 1994: 257) is also the means for narrative exchange, confirming the ‘liminal’ nature of the journey. At backpacker hostels for example, one can be fairly sure of finding like minded people, their ‘intimate co-presence’ bound up with with human intercourse, socialisation, self-presentation and ‘strategic impression management’ (Goffman, 1969a), part of the ‘theatre’ that enables backpackers to learn, practice and perform in the presence of an audience, not simply as an end in itself, but also involving narratives which contain ‘their own temporalities (memories, expectations, temporal ordering) and their own spatialities (place, pathways, territories)’ (Simonsen, 2004: 58).

I have noted that the strategic carrier moves within the center of the scapes, seeking mastery of the world provided for them, while the tactical backpacker seeks to retain unpredicatability by turning the scapes into an infinity of opportunities without rejecting the role itself, role distance described by MacCanell (1976: 9) as ‘man’s need to appear holier than his fellow lives’ as they aim to impose their vision. Given their shared socialisation, the habitus operates to a relatively coherent logic, a mediator that enables meanings and practices to be inter-subjectively harmonised anywhere along the scapes where overlapping tendencies, harmony of ethos and taste generates interplay and affective relations, all of which can make movement easier but also reinforces feelings of ontological security and immediate social gratification. Like the ‘Tourist’ and ‘Vagabond’ (Bauman, 1998), the less experienced backpacker and the more competent, knowledgeable ‘sabateur’ need each other and the scapes (as it needs them), their varying competences, experiences, skills and knowledge crossing over in all sorts of ways; ‘composing and recomposing lives in a manner that illustrates their subtle modifications and detours, as well as their more fixed attachments and territories’ (Allen and Pryke, 1999: 53).

Their differing positioning enables ‘information flows by word-of-mouth from the experienced travellers to the newcomer’ (Cohen, 1973: 96), wherein subjects ‘endowed with the aptitude and the inclination’ seek to ‘establish the differences which are held to be significant in the social world under consideration’ (Bourdieu, 2001: 71; original emphasis), struggles establishing social hierarchies as individuals actively taking up different views and re-defining the parameters of his/her involvement in the world (Pons, 2003). This, I

---

137 Islam (1996) describes a difference between sedentary and nomadic travellers, noting how a sedentary traveller moves through ‘rigid lines’ which keep them grounded between fixed lines and following customary paths. It is movement that ends up building the process of Othering, since sedentary travellers take their ‘portable territory’ with them.
argue means interplay is often full of turbulence, as various actors are locked into relations of conflict, contestation and cooperation that enlivens the scapes, as each and every individual wittingly or unwittingly becomes a producer and reproducer of the scapes, their actions, words and works a product of a modus operandi whose ‘discourse continuously feeds off itself like a train bringing along its own rails’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 78). As Crouch (1999: 4) explains ‘[t]o make a spatial practice is to engage in a transformation, nor to return or imagine a past, but to creatively enliven, to repeat only the possibility of a new, unique moment’. Tactical explorations138 are incorporated into travel narratives and continually communicated since they cannot be kept, but at the risk of them being challenged, upheld or changed through social interaction (Sørensen, 2003). As old practices lose their cultural value and new cultural capital creates new distinction, Bourdieu (1984: 569) noting that struggles over cultural capital ‘[create] legitimacy, by creating belief not in the value of this or that stake but in the value of the game in which the value of all the stakes is produced and reproduced’. This interplay becomes an integral part of the ‘bottom-up’ creation of backpacker culture (Noy, 2006) as victories continually churn with every cycle before becoming mapped through gradual innovation and transformation of the scapes. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992: 107) argue that ‘[i]ndividuals exist as agents who are socially constituted as active and acting in the field under consideration by the fact that they possess the necessary properties to be effective, to produce effects, in this field’, the interplay between backpackers helping to determine the scapes by providing the seeds and means for the scapes reproduction, its continued rejuvenation and its spread, backpackers both ‘the product of this structure and continually make and remake this structure’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 140). Backpackers, whatever the position, still acknowledge that ‘[w]herever we happen to be at the moment, we cannot help knowing that we could be elsewhere, so there is less and less reason to stay anywhere in particular’ (Bauman, 1998: 77), ‘impelled to continue from sensation-to-sensation’ (Bauman, 1998: 94). Even if each pause leads to unfulfilled expectations, the prospect of new sensations in each new place leads to more travel and anticipation. Bauman (2001:731) notes now the ‘march must go on because an place of arrival is but a temporary station. No place is priviled, no place better than another’ and no backpacker ‘ought not to forget the horizon from which they proceed, nor, at, the other extreme, the horizon towards which they are likely to go’ (de Certeau, 1988: 41), accepting ‘all forward movements as movements

138 These travellers feel they can take possession of the scapes, using their new found abilities and skills, producing their experience of it through their own tactical appropriations, if only within its limits and bounds.
toward his goal’ (Tuan, 1977: 73). Each avoids encounters that could tie them down financially, socially, spatially or personally; as getting ‘bogged down in place would disrupt rather than reward the project of ‘knowing' the world through travel’ (Oakes, 2006b: 244), preventing the ‘arousal of strong affections for any of the places; places we occupy are no more than temporary stations’ (Bauman, 1992b: 188).

7.7 The non-western backpacker habituses.

The western backpacker habitus is not the only system of desire / subjectivity / habitus that emerges in the scapes, the diversity of social, cultural and political systems bringing into the field, multiple habituses, meaning there are systematic differences which separate a singular world-view even if adopted from ‘singular but concerted standpoints' (Bourdieu, 1977: 86). The individual remains dependent on his or her ‘cultural sphere', ‘the product of the language, the traditions, the convictions, the customs and landscapes in which he came into the world' (Beck, 2002: 36), bringing dispositional traces of their own with them, meaning the early stages of the socialisation process are created through those with familiar bodies (language, ethnicity, age). Because the make up of backpacker flows has been primarily western, white, English speaking and heterosexual, the scapes have adjusted primarily but not exclusively to reflect this cultural attainment and outcome. For South Koreans, Israelis, Japanese and other nationalities, the scapes remain contested, and they are often nudged towards taking up a marginal position given their lack of competence at English, their passive approach to identity development and tendency toward ‘uncertainty avoidance’ (Cohen, 2004; Maoz, 2007a). Recent studies have focused on the Asian backpackers (Gee Lim, 2008; Maoz, 2007a; Muzaini, 2006; Teo and Leong, 2006) with the aim to ‘de-centre' the Western focus of much backpacker literature and ‘reclaim epistemological space’ for the neglected backpackers from Israel, China, Japan and South Korea.

Given the scapes are deeply perspectival constructs, Japanese and Israeli backpackers have sought to interpret and construct a very different way of imagining the world not entirely based simply on linguistic differences. The scapes, skewed towards a western masculine logic (Pritchard and Morgan, 2000a,b) does not necessarily lead to an expansion of the horizons for all, given they can limit or constrain certain ethnic groups from fully participating or claiming a position within them, leading many to seek out their own ancillary spaces. Rather than be marginalised, the Israeli backpacker habitus has
integrated Israeli culture, traditions, media, history, military service and language to develop their own set of dispositions that can be seen as a structural variant of the western habitus. Since they have a different habitus, westerners are able to pass judgment explicitly on the Israelis, having little time / ability to invest in the social, cultural, linguistic and religious capital required to become socialised into their habitus (and vice-versa). I argue that the imagination is a staging ground for ‘deeply perspectival constructs, inflected by the historical, linguistic, and political situatedness of different sorts of actors’ (Appadurai, 1990: 296), one which Israelis backpackers have re-interpreted and re-constructed, creating their own spaces, dispositions, orientations and patterns of action. Other backpackers, from non-western nations may be unable or unwilling to act out their imagination, and are often excluded from this world, but given the Chinese (Gee Lim, 2009) and Japanese (Prideaux and Shiga, 2007) in particular have distinct particular linguistic, historical, social and cultural codes, I argue there will never be a singular, pure drifter / backpacker habitus, no ‘turned-on league of nations,’ who ‘could dress, talk and travel the same language’ (Neville, 1970: 207-210).

7.8 Chapter Summary.
For Giddens, ‘[t]he orderliness of day-to-day life is a miraculous occurrence, … it is brought about as a continuous achievement on the part of everyday actors’ (Giddens, 1991: 52). I argue backpackers take an imaginative leap, their desire and motivation taking them on a journey through an imagined world (community) that have a spatial, social and temporal logic, enabling them to move past fantasy and step into a world of possibility and constraint, positioning that world I call ‘travellerscapes’ around them and constituting that world as ‘ready-to-hand’. Blending the social with the spatial, measuring ‘space and time on their active construction of a meaningful world’ (Simonsen, 2004: 48), I argue individuals manifest a desire and belief in the field / game and the value of its stakes, doxic adherence to the illusio allowing geographically dispersed individuals to leave home, the ‘absorption’ of the doxa manifesting itself in a non-linear socialisation process that requires inclination, belief and time. Mobility remains at the centre of this world, each backpacker sustaining the ‘reality’ of the scapes by yielding to encounters structured as valuable capital, enabling individuals to gain gradual access to this world and the knowledge, skills and competencies embedded within it, picking up cues from others, before they too can become competent and knowledgeable as they learn bodily, their routinised bodily performances over time engendering a more natural and at ease ‘projection’ over time. By
using Bourdieu, I look afresh at a travelling culture, its underlying structures, transcending the binary dictonomies and typologies typically used to describe the disparate practices and performances associated with backpacking. I argue backpackers are neither unreflexive nor passive as researchers are prone to suggest, their being-in-the-world meaning the scapes are incorporated into the backpackers ‘grandiose subjectivity’ and exerted as a (western) backpacker habitus, through which a identity can be fashioned.

I argue that as western subjects leave their old habitus behind and pre-position themselves within this imaginary world, their primary concern is initially ‘one of uncertainty reduction or increasing predictability about the behaviour of both themselves and others in the interaction’ (Berger and Calabrese, 1975: 100). Interacting with others through inter-subjective movement that exposes individuals to socialities, interactions, connections, attachments and encounters, deriving specific meaning from objectified capital (narrative capital) that gives them admittance into this world. While the scapes are largely autonomous, the centre of the scapes provides them with an objective world from which ‘the will to subjectivity draws its criteria and stabilizes, radicalizes, or meliorates those criteria’ (Rudy, 2006: 59). Without being subject to fixed rules or a written ideology, this world is inter-subjectively real, as individuals inherit ‘the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product’ (Bourdieu, 1990a: 56), the journey arming them with a set of dispositions that ‘survives in the present and tends to perpetuate itself into the future by making itself present in practices structured according to its principles’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 82). I argued there is a continuum between strategic and tactical positions, disparate points on a continuum on which we can find discrete gradations or depth and breath. Those starting their trip incorporate a habitus that is strategic in the way it develops, is demonstrated and communicated and acted upon, the socialisation process initially fastening the subject firmly to social structures (to the world provided), generating practices and performances that have a visible coherence, and which can be acted upon strategically upon by cultural intermediaries. They seek to highlight their ‘commitment to the presuppositions’ of the field they are playing (Bourdieu, 1990a: 66), driving them from sensation to sensation, preoccupied with accumulating and communicate the ‘right’ objectified capital as they adequately express their ‘new birth’ outwardly in the presence of others. Reflexively monitoring themselves, they seek out places of identifications that act as a tool for self-regulation, objectified capital enabling them to have (and share) a daily history with others, their need for proximity, solidarity, co-presence and sociability crucial for ‘social activities and practices to occur’ (Adey, 2009: 27). However mapped, this world
is ‘read’ with the mind and body ‘in and through the movements and displacements which make the space within which they are enacted as much as they are made it by’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 90).

The accumulated capital serves as a resource for more ‘grounded’ action meaning they don’t have to make a decision about everything, newly internalised dispositions at least partially incorporated into individuals’ subjectivity. As the scapes get ‘under the skin’ each new encounter and experience provides new learning opportunities and reflexivity that soon demands some re-interpretation of the role, the enthusiasm in which they seek capital and interact with other travellers not without reflection. While reflexivity or cognitive reflection is initially used to grasp the objectified world, the accumulation of (embodied) capital enable individuals to act with a deeper knowledge and understanding of the scapes and their position in it, peeling back the scapes to recognise its boundaries so as to perform greater autonomy. While strategic backpackers tend to misrecognise the scapes as an external, naturally given world, I argued that tactical backpackers recognise the scapes as a game and deeming it worthy of struggle, use mobility to achieve a better sense of self and establish greater satisfaction within their own lives even if this is assessed more subjectively.

Their position depends less on ‘objcified’ achievements and places visited but their repeated performativity (Butler, 1993) that is produced as a committed way of life. This renegotiation and reimagination is worked individually through role distance that does not undermine their invesment in the game (illusio). These backpackers see a range of visible tactical options and opportunities available as they journey, their performance affirming their authentic self and their ‘superior’ position to themselves and others, feeling they are ahead of the flow of the game. They are ahead, because of the immanent tendencies of the game in their body as they embody the game (Bourdieu, 1998: 80-81), ‘while the bad player is always off tempo, always too early or too late’ (ibid, 81). Some of their practices and performance might transgress the ‘proper’, since they gain position by differentiateing themselves againt perceived attempts to co-opt their subjectivity, requiring competence, resourcefulness, endurance and fortitude, their embodied capital enabling those competencies to be deployed as a weapon and as stake of struggle which allows its possessors to wield a power, an influence, and thus to exist, in the field’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 98). They wander around the scapes boundaries like orbiting satelites, ‘making consumers into immigrants in a system too vast to be their own, too tightly woen
to escape from' (de Certeau, 1988: xx), in the hope of 'reclaiming' the space organised by socio-cultural production (de Certeau, 1988) through reimagining it’s boundaries and their position in it, a rejection of the more ‘touristic’ representations and spatio-temporal restrictions’ (Edensor, 1998a: 53), though still reimagining ‘within the system which they assimilated and which assimilated them externally’ (de Certeau, 1988: 32). Role distance is merely ‘an extreme instance of expressions’ (Goffmann, 1969b), not necessarily altering deeply held beliefs, such as the magnetic pull of the next sensation. A tactical stance is not pure resistance but ‘an art of putting one over on the adversary on his own turf, hunter’s tricks, maneuverable, the polymorph mobilities, jubilant, poetic, and warlike discoveries’ (de Certeau, 1988: 40), performed by the same backpackers who months before had a strategic stance, their learning trajectory over time abandoning taken for granted orientations to adopt a more reflexive and tactical mode of operation.

The strategic and tactical are are not bi-polar opposites, but act within a continuum of positions and learning possibilities, intertwining, interacting, clashing and combining to struggle over the scapes stakes, and in the process, rejuvenating the scapes as new stakes emerge. It is only through struggle and position taking that values continually change within this established hierarchy, each backpacker needing but also competing against the other, but all are ‘taken in by the game, even though they might oppose one another, sometimes with ferocity, only to the extent that they concur in their belief (doxa) in the game and its stakes’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 98). The practices we associate with backpacking are performed ‘on the move’ and are atuned to the goals of the game, a tacit recognition of the value of the stakes of a game (capital), which broadly relates to the constitution of ‘real’ travel. Therefore, it is not correct to say the strategic backpacker is rule bound, or the tactical backpacker outside the pale on off the beaten tracks, with neither constituting a ‘purer’ or a more ‘authentic’ aspect of the habitus. There is no ‘perfect reproduction’, no fixed ideal to guage by, each performance, having ‘dropped notes, missed cues, and fluffed entrances’ (Thrift, 2004b: 130). While the strategic carrier might be taken in by the role and the world provided for them, the tactical carriers often express frustration at its boundaries and limits of the scapes in light of their knowledge and skill. Whatever victories won, they are still left looking at a world beyond their reach, their struggle largely against the very spaces and travellers that initially produced them, still ‘marked bodies’, unable to blend into the crowd, assuming ‘a similiar representational role on foreign soil: they are both living symbols of another nationalism’ (Diller and Scofidio, 1994: 24). Their practices, even if tactical never cease to conform to economic calculation, even when it gives ‘every
appearance of disinterestedness by departing from the logic of interested calculation (in the narrow sense) and playing for stakes that are non-material and not easily quantified’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 177), the habitus not some fixed ideal, but simply offering ‘conditioned and conditional freedom’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 95), a set of dispositions which own their ‘availability, composition, and force to the socialisation process in which it was acquired’ (Lahire, 2003: 329).
Chapter Eight: Landscapes of Power: Habitus Performed.
8.1 Introduction.

Backpacker mobility is often characterised as self-directed and agency-driven, with individuals who can leisurely and aimlessly utilise local transport from place to place, primarily concerned with existential authenticity as they seek encounters with the people, cultures and places they traverse, their romantic and embodied gaze in stark contrast to the directed and distanced collective gaze of the tourist. Rarely is the relationship between the backpackers sense of self, the scapes and ‘fields of power’ addressed or the inter-relationship between backpacking, the tourism industry and regulatory frameworks investigated even though those relationships can potentially transform the scapes materiality, discursively and symbolically. I have argued that the drifters created a distinctive countercultural way of seeing the world, one which was as much imaginary as real as they made the journey east happenable and performable, with ideas of what to expect becoming widely circulated in the underground press and alternative guidebooks, until the authorities sought to make their experience very real by imposing tough entry requirements.

Today, these same high status actors hope to preserve, flatten and expand the scapes, shaping their ‘structural coherence’ (Harvey, 1985) so as to ‘profitably’ reproduce backpacking and seeking to impose relatively firm and fixed boundaries so as to attract greater swaths of society through new ‘backpacker’ (large scale) sub-fields / positions that favour a ‘bundle of middle-class lifestyles’ (Peck, 2009) formed around over-work, expressive play and conspicuous consumption. As a bricoleur seeking knowledge production, it is important to study the ;invisible, the forces of power that try and operate under the radar to shape what is going on in the world, in media, in the political arena’ (Kincheloe, 2004a: 142). I argue that the scapes have been inscribed with specific normative economic and political meanings with Mitchell (1996) noting how powerful actors naturally seek to represent the landscapes of practice as fixed and total, producing it as a commodity, seeking to appropriate ‘the sayings of the tribe’ (doxa) and thereby acquire ‘the power the group exerts over itself through its officia language’ (Bourdieu, 1990a: 110). Utilising Bourdieu, this chapter asks whether the scapes are over-determined’ by political, economic and cultural forces, producing stylised landscapes of sign and image and whether over-determination can lead to individuals resisting the scapes objectification. This chapter while initially addressing current literature regarding this world, reverts to the bricolage to describe a sub-field of restricted cultural production (marché restreinte) that
includes new ways of moving, dwelling and communicating. Based on interviews and notes that took place during a Couchsurfing.com event called ‘London Calling’ in London during June 2006 and a annual hospitality exchange event called ‘Winter Camp’ which took place in Istanbul, Turkey, in December 2007, I argue the data is pointing to new small scale production directed towards a circuit of peers (the supply side coinciding with the demand side). Enveloping this data into the bricoalge, I argue for a world in which participants struggle to impose a world-view, to push the limits of the scapes, to push out those boundaries imposed by movies, guidebooks, hostels and other travellers – to push the limits imposed by the values and objectives of those who profit from movement and those who seeking to control and manage mobility. Bourdieu (1986) argues that reproduction strategies are exposed by subversive critique to be arbitraw, with holders of capital likely to resort to better concealed, albeit less guaranteed, strategies of reproduction. I argue one such alternative means to capital is through a social networking site called couchsurfing.com, its participants seen as struggling for self-interest in opposition to large-scale production (marché élargie), feeling their participation in such a site better represents their social world as they assume it should be, the performance of mobility contributing to a critical practice. Such practices can give rise to a negotiation between the imagined world (community) and the everyday.

8.2 Managing Backpacking: Let the right one in.

While backpacking re-emerged in the late 1980’s, the scapes were partially re-written through touristic discourses and reconstructed with reference to a surrounding media culture. However, as a habitus (performed), rather than stripped of countercultural content, the scapes and their underlying logic retained their ethos and fundamental truths, as individuals continued to voluntarily identify with this largely autonomous world’s core stakes. Policy-makers, planners and many in the tourism industry who acted strategically to manage mobility were at first wary due to the negative connotations associated with drifters. It wasn’t until the label ‘backpacker’ came to be produced as a clearly defined discursive category in the early 1990’s and a ‘internal-external dialectic of identification’ (Jenkins, 1996) that backpacking became accepted, but only as a form / type of tourism. Coming out of a global recession in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s, governments throughout the world became responsive to the forces and energy that this world and its unsettled bodies unleashed. The scapes were revitalised and embraced, enabled by various systems, infrastructures and actors that began to support backpackers. Like other
socio-spatial practices such as walking\textsuperscript{139} (Macnaghten and Urry, 1998), the habitus ‘performed’ moved from being seen as something negative to becoming ascribed with more positive and responsible characteristics (Lislie, 2008).

Governments\textsuperscript{140} and entrepreneurs began to have a practical sense of this world and its inhabitants needs, their dispositions seen as durable through economic downturns and unforeseen events, making them an attractive long-term investment. Backpacking today is viewed as strategically important by an increasing number of businesses, regions, institutions and governments (Allon et al, 2008a,b; Slaughter, 2004), their mobility becoming central to many economics and livelihoods as recent national strategies and/or reports issued by New Zealand, Malaysia, Fiji, South Africa and Australia illustrate (Allon et al, 2008b; Jarvis and Peel, 2010; Rogerson, 2007) along with reports from the UNWTO (2008) and the World Youth Student and Educational (WYSE)\textsuperscript{141} Travel Confederation illustrate. Forecasts about backpacker numbers have entered local, national and international debates in many of these countries, because of their role in tight labour markets, regeneration strategies and a time of global recession. The WYSE believes youth tourism (including backpacking) is worth US$136 billion a year or around 18\% of worldwide international tourism receipts; the term ‘backpacker’ now extensively used to characterise an idealised mobile type (young, single, fit, white, affluent, mobile and economically productive). For example, successive Australian governments and its tourism industry have through deliberate strategies and investment been at the forefront in expanding the backpacker label, channeling and directing ‘backpackers’ to central business districts, sites of regeneration and harvest networks, producing their first National Backpacker Tourism Strategy (CDOT, 1995) in 1995; a process that has been followed by two more Federal reports about backpacking in 2002 and 2003 as well as numerous state, industry and consultancy reports.

8.3 Over-determination and Over-there.

There is no doubt that operators, facilitators, consultants, receiving countries, educators,

\textsuperscript{139} Ingold (2004: 321) notes how the ‘affluent did not undertake to travel for its own sake, however, or for the experience it might afford. Indeed the actual process of travel, especially on foot, was considered a drudge - literally a travail - that had to be endured for the sole purpose of reaching a destination’ before the Romantic poets turned walking into an experience of virtue. Ingold (2004: 322) argues ‘walking was for the poor, the criminal, the young, and above all, the ignorant....Only in the 19th century, following the example set by Wordsworth and Coleridge, did people of leisure take to walking as an end in itself, beyond the confines of the landscaped garden or gallery’.

\textsuperscript{140} The 2009 New Zealand Backpacker Conference addressed issues such as ‘new segments in the backpacker market’ and was attended by the Prime Minister of New Zealand and the Chief Executive of Tourism New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{141} The confederation was founded in 2006 with the merger of the Federation of International Youth Travel Organisations (FIYTO) and the International Student Travel Confederation (ISTC) (http://www.wysetc.org/).
policy-makers, academics, governments, newspapers, parents, and employers have overseen the backpacker label’s extension, the nurturing of new ‘kinds’ of more organised, institutionalised and structured backpackers such as the gapper, working holiday maker (WHM), volunteer backpacker, ‘overland’ tour, grey nomad, study backpacker and flashpacker. These (imagined) mobile subjects / sub-fields have come to dominate discussion about backpacking, many of the above actors persuasive in their promotion of these more ‘sustainable’, ‘productive’ and ‘structured’ mobilities, becoming the centre of policy for many countries who have given these sub-fields mobility rights and legal recognition. From the university programmes¹⁴² that facilitate ‘gap years’ to companies that help employees to take ‘productive’ career sabbaticals, ‘maximum free time’ is harnessed to attain cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986). Recognition for these positions has also come from governments, as specific visa categories have been introduced, including the WHM, volunteer and foreign student visas, visas which are primarily offered to the young, mobile and the affluent (often with strict requirements), primarily offered across and between western countries (while poorer countries offer non-reciprocal ‘volunteer’ visas to the same cohort). The absence from their stations of the daily world are often socially and institutionally sanctioned (Hall, 2005a,b), positions which embody a logic governed by their job back home, by the boundaries of their volunteer house, the confines of a tour bus, gap year programme and visa conditions, unable to withdraw from economic necessity and ‘objective and subjective distance from practical urgencies’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 54).

These positions have made the ‘backpacker’ category ‘material and intelligible, while foreclosing on the instability of that category’ (Lewis and Pile, 1996: 23), positions that work outside the socialisation process but are positions from which to understand the scapes in particular ways. Newcomers entering through these sub-fields are often given institutional legitimacy and support, but are often ignored by field incumbents (backpackers), their presence potentially having material, political and symbolic consequences on the autonomy of the field, since these positions can be packaged, structured, planned and sold, often offering the promise of a ‘legitimate’ contact with the ‘local’ ‘off-the-beaten track’ situations with exposure to genuine places and cultures. These positions or players need not affect the performed habitus; the scapes sustained as long as those who inhabit such extended positions conform to the logic of the field and accept doxa or ‘the fundamental belief in the value of the stakes’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 102). In reality, their commitment to the field’s doxa

¹⁴² Princeton, Yale and Harvard introduced gap years into their admissions and undergraduate programmes in 2009.
often only extends to its form related characteristics such as accommodation, their mobility instead overlapping increasingly with social, entertainment/media, political, leisure, economic and educational fields, impacting upon everything from university admission policies, systems of political governance, charities to labour markets.

As backpacking has become a visible global industry with reports and strategies confirming and publicising its economic potential, extended positions have become overtly tied and validated by cultural intermediaries who seek to communicate their worth/value and give them political, cultural and ideological character. These 'merchants of leisure' (Hannigan, 2007) or 'new cultural intermediaries' (Featherstone, 1991) have helped them 'succeed' by taking care of visas, vaccinations, paperwork, itineraries, transport, job placement and accommodation, often offering the scapes in a very reductive form. These intermediaries are important since they define which cultural knowledge and practices are worth knowing, often using their symbolic power to disqualify the value given to 'traditional' and less-structured 'traditional' backpacker practices, given the difficulty in selling backpackers specific or standardised consumption 'packages' (Giddens, 1991).

The extension of the label 'backpacker' can cover a multitude of motivations and personalised, subjective temporalities, and are often promoted through schools, universities and the mass media while mediated through government schemes, gap year organisations, career counsellors, employer groups, NGO's, charities and universities and supported and served by formal and dedicated service sectors. The production of public discourses about these positions has opened up the scapes to a greater number of people, positions that are protected, defended and promoted by powerful interests, associations and societal institutions (religious, educational, touristic, economic). These positions often demand (social, economic and cultural capital) with high entry requirements, but in turn signify social taste, social class and distinction. Very dependent on the 'new' and/or 'aesthetic' middle classes (Featherstone, 1991; Urry, 1995), they perceive and interact within the field differently, their habitus influencing tastes, preferences and lifestyle choices, but under conditions set by the 'standardising effects of commodity capitalism' (Giddens, 1991: 196). Through intermediaries, the middle class have gained access and appropriated form related 'aspects' of backpacking, producing class-specific consumption practices and tastes which are now institutionally and socially represented as beneficial pursuits (for

143 Wilson et al, (2007) followed a Contiki van tour on a circuit that began in Pamplona, Spain in July at the Running of the Bulls (Pamps) and finishing in Germany in October at the Munich Oktoberfest (Beerfest).
careers, universities, countries, communities and for individuals themselves in the search for a better job or university), their more structured elements sold as a positive choice in a life biography, their properties ‘pertinent, effective, and liable to function as capital so as to generate specific profits’ (Bourdieu, 1988: 11). The scapes are flattened, marketed and sold to this class as a coherent, identity rich landscape of consumption, a commodity that can be sold with its participants often paying extensively for the privilege of volunteering, travelling, learning, socialising, working or simply playing and having fun. While the scapes were once home to a peripheral and shadow flow, which drew suspicion and distrust, there has been a transformation in regulatory and corporate activity, as local states, private-public partnerships and multinationals locate within the scapes boundaries, certain sub-fields given particular political, cultural and market value, inviting a host of product and service providers (book publishers, television production companies, doctors, travel agents, tour guides, bus drivers, universities, charities, newspapers, magazines) to earn a living or benefit directly and indirectly from extended positions.

While each position is different, the informal interplay, exposure and encounter that reproduce the scapes requires elements of homogeneity, and while there is some overlap in form related characteristics, the pertinent metaphor for many of their position participants is ‘trekking-through’ (Sager, 2005), their decentred pattern of personalised, subjective mobilities and temporal investments breaking down encounters into more fragmented pieces, the scapes conquered rather than fostering belonging. For Allon et al, (2008a: 75) these unstable preferences mean the backpacker is ‘also often an employee, a student, a visitor, a seasonal worker, holidaymaker, a semi-permanent resident, and potentially many other roles and identities’, backpacking only ‘temporarily or provisionally occupied or adopted’ (ibid. 86) as a temporary ‘a mind-set’ (Cooper et al, 2004), the subject decentred, strung out in mobile identities and mobility related ambitions and projects, which tends towards spatial dispersion as well as social and temporal fragmentation. Rather than ‘serious leisure’ (Stebbins, 2007), it suggests that individuals are increasingly undertaking ‘backpacking’ as ‘casual leisure’, requiring little or no socialisation. There is nothing inherently wrong in these developments, since these positions fit into people’s lifestyles, enabling individuals to ‘explore and define their own identities’ (Gottdiener, 2000: 22). However, they are not bodily ‘exposed to the world’ or ‘capable of being conditioned by the world, shaped by the material and cultural conditions of existence in which it is placed’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 134). Since many of these travellers take less ‘personal responsibility’ for the scapes’ boundaries, researchers can no longer a priori assume similarity across
individuals in the scapes, with many ‘backpackers’ unable or unwilling to join in its learning trajectory or exploring (and exploiting) its ambiguities or their own subjectivities, making it more difficult for backpackers to establish a relationship between one thing or person and others or position oneself in affinity with others. Like travelling on a motorway, such sub-fields manifest themselves in diversified mobility preferences, movement not necessarily binding individuals to others, especially at the centre of the scapes where people, goods, images and capital can circulate very quickly, the concept of ‘we’ emptied out as individuals come up against an even faster circulation of bodies, images, ideas and other selves (Lash and Urry, 1994), speed bringing about the progressive weakening of the scapes social structure.

Critics have gone further to argue that powerful actors operating in collaboration with globalising forces of consumer capital and tourism are objectifying the scapes and attacking ‘tradition’ (Giddens, 1991). While summarising their arguments, they are, I believe, largely overblown. Firstly, because any attempt to contrast practices today with those of the 1960’s is nonsensical, since dispositions forged in the 1960’s were forged in a different social world; one that has changed continuously, the scapes always in a process of becoming, always offering constraints and opportunities in equal measure. Secondly, the scapes are ‘performed through everyone’s effort to define it’ (Latour, 1986: 275), with few external agents having the symbolic power, to shape or re-shape ‘space, place and presence’ (Sheller and Urry, 2006: 3). Thirdly, backpackers, like the drifters before them will initially accept the world as it is given before potentially investing in its cracks and ‘in-betweens’, no individual given god like knowledge of the scapes before socialisation. The scapes, critics argue, are increasingly individualised, commercialised, intensified and shaped by forces external to backpackers themselves, stripping them of their subjectivity and agency, making the scapes desubjectified and a mass-tourism playground (Westerhausen and Macbeth, 2003), transformed ‘into just another variant of mass, institutionalized tourism’ (Scheyvens, 2002a: 160). They argue this world is now framed within market institutions (Caruana et al, 2008), bringing backpacking into a more consumer-dominated cultural field and bringing the once subversive habitus ‘into line’, by progressively altering the scapes operating conditions. They argue that those who mobilise a tactical habitus have little power to ‘transform, partially or completely, the immanent rules of the game’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 99), their fleeting victories ‘constantly in the swim of things’ and in danger of being swept away or submerged by the flow of events’ (Buckanan, 2000: 89).
For many commentators (Cohen, 2004; O’Reilly, 2006; Welk, 2004), backpacking is becoming increasingly comparable to conventional mass tourism; an argument often accompanied by lamentations about the loss the drifter practices (Cohen, 2004). Rather than a ‘preference for small-scale, locally owned accommodation and independent travel arrangements’ (Weaver, 2006: 47), uninterested in ‘amenities (e.g., plumbing), restaurants (e.g., Westernized food), and transportation (e.g., air conditioning)’ (Riley, 1988: 323), today’s backpacker are seen as demanding as mass tourists (cf. Chapter 6). However, I argue that ‘human subjectivity embodies itself in products that are available to oneself and one’s fellow men as elements of a common world’ (Berger and Pullberg, 1965: 199), expressing the modern subject’s need to objectify the world while at the same time experiencing it as a subject (Oakes, 2006b). Drifters themselves were responsible for an overland scene with its own restaurants, hotels, meeting places, products and services (Cohen 1973; Vogt 1976; Riley, 1988; Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995), helping individuals to articulate a position and build an identity across time and space. I do agree that any scape can be ‘invaded, occupied, bought, moved, used, viewed and consumed’ (Sheller, 2003), exploited like a resource (Giddens, 1991) with the tourism industry spearheading developments that sell the scapes as self-contained systems so as to exploit movement in a rational, forecastable manner. De Certeau, Appadurai and Bourdieu have little to say on the institutionalisation and commodification of global scapes, but there is no doubt ‘the more organized tourism gets, the more mediatized it becomes - and the more it is turned into simulation’ (Jansson, 2002: 437-438), ‘densely managed, regulated and controlled by people and institutions acting as playwrights, directors and stage crew’ (Bærenholdt et al, 2004: 51). As the scapes themselves can be conquered rather than felt or experienced (Koshar, 2000), they are ‘ever easier to be visited, appreciated and compared, but not known from within’ (Szerszynski and Urry, 2006: 127), the gap between the supposed ethos of the scapes and practice seen in their relationship with the Other noted by critics.

Backpackers have long sought to share the local lifestyle and see the place through the eyes of a ‘stranger’ (Simmel, 1997), citing ‘meeting the people’ as key factor in travel (Riley, 1988), with backpackers having an idealised picture of what constitutes genuine with other people and ‘it should not involve money’144‘ (Suvantola, 2002: 228), or ‘as little commodification of the relationship between traveller and the Other as possible’

144 All countercultures seek to imagine themselves as exempt from the marketplace (Adams, 2004). Stephens (1998) argues ‘free’ as a word and concept functioned like an icon in the 1960’s, taking on an almost physical actuality, deliberately contextualized as to its subversive potential, the journey east seen as ‘uncontaminated from the ‘polluting influences of money’ (Stephens, 1998: 53).
The search for authentic backstage experiences and encounters constitutes a type of distinction that generative capital (economic, cultural) cannot buy, the presumed authenticity of fleeting encounters connections that come with *Otherness* confirming their position in the scapes and providing self-actualisation, self-expression, self-image and self-gratification. Allon (2004) argues the very essence of being a backpacker is actually immersion into the local culture and has been since the hippies, with Hall (1968) noting the urge to identify with the more ‘authentic’ *Other* (American Indians, Mexicans, African Americans), their quest for ‘authentic’ informal participatory activities and the shunning of any form of tourist ‘insulation’ frequently highlighted (Desforges, 1998, 2000; Riley, 1988; Loker, 1993; Loker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995). When backpackers talk about ‘peak experiences’ (Maslow, 1968) to describe the moments where they felt most at ease on their journey and in themselves, it usually occurs when the self and journey become one, the self-validating, self-justifying moments that routinely involve encounters with ‘locals’ or special backstage places, moments when they achieve mastery and reach their fullest potential as travellers. Stories where backpackers get a local price or where or when they are admitted into local reciprocities fulfills a central value for backpackers, experiences which self-actualising individuals seek but cannot plan for, happening only through happenstance and without mediation, fostering a sense of being unique, competent, whole, alive, self-organising, self-directed and self-sufficient. Maslow notes how these moments come ‘as a by-product, an epiphenomenon, for instance, of doing a fine job at a worthy task you can identity with’ (Wilson, 1972: 15). Once experienced, they seek to re-enact these moments consciously and subconsciously given that they reinforce their new subjectivity and are evidence of their transformation, marking out their attitudes, beliefs more fully to themselves and others (Mills, 1973), encounters creating a ‘heightened sense of self’ (Obenour, 2004: 12) where one is being most true to oneself and one’s world.

Huxley (2005) found that the expanding culture of backpacking has made it more difficult for backpackers to experience local culture even if they are driven to do so; never able to acquire the knowledge and understanding of locals, or transform oneself into the expression of the other. Huxley notes various constrains such as economic asymmetry, imbalanced roles and relationships, time and the presence of other backpackers, the ‘company of fellow- tourists and tourist guides also serves as a buffer insulating many travellers from the difficulties and possibly some delights of the visited culture’ (Pearce,
Moreover, Oakes (2006a) and Hannerz (1996) note that many ‘locals’ while not exploiting travellers, do not admit them into local reciprocities, less honoured to host distant strangers than making sure they spend money, refusing to play along in the tourist’s dream of reciprocity. Huxley (2005: 41-42) describes economic asymmetry as the difference in attitudes of locals and travellers towards money and their relationship with technology while imbalanced roles and relationships account for the distinction of ‘host’ and ‘guest’ roles, with Hottola (2005) noting ‘metasapces’ entail new closures for interacting with locals, as a ‘buffer against culture confusion’ (Hottola, 2005: 5).

The host–guest relationship, Huxley feels is an unequal one, since the ‘guest’ is in a position of leisure, able to simply gaze upon their chosen destination, people, and culture, while the ‘hosts’ are working and must perform their expected everyday duties and are not obliged to go sightseeing like the tourist (MacCannell, 1976). As ‘everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation’ (Debord, 1977: 1), representational space has moved into the space of the conceived and the perceived (representations of space), local knowledge gleaned by backpackers often partial and incomplete. Other factors like language difficulties, cultural barriers and even choice of accommodation affect interaction, the backpacker bubble ‘meaning very few travelers encounter local people in non-commercial settings’ (Fitzgerald, 2000: np), the myth of the ‘authentic other’ and the ‘authentically social’ unattainable (Selwyn, 1996: 21), forgoing close understanding of the locals and their culture for ‘instant authenticity wrapped in a nice package’ (Maoz, 2006: 234), ‘soothing ideological anxieties while extending commercialization and the tourism industry’ (Hutnyk, 1996: x).

MacCannell, (2001: 383) argues:

> Any thought one might have entertained about getting to know the life of the native peoples as it is actually lived, or discovering for oneself the actual feelings and textures of a famous stone wall or monument, or be-comeing identified with the remoteness and mystery of the place, quickly give way to the realization that the dominant element in every tourist landscape are the tourists. The others one meets in tourist settings are other tourists and local workers whose job it is to serve tourists.

However, to leave it here, would be a form of ‘touristic surrender’ (Bruner, 1995; Tucker, 2003), where backpackers apart from fleeting victories relinquish agency and surrender a key discursive practice and cultural disposition as the search for encounters, reciprocity and relations with the Other unachievable. However, I have argued that backpackers

---

146 Howard (2005) in his analysis of the Khao San Road backpacker enclave in Bangkok, Thailand found that only twenty percent of travellers socialised extensively with locals.
continually challenge subject-object dualisms; *Otherness* too powerful an indicator of capital and self-identity, its scarcity making it even more yearned for. Since the reflexive subject is not conceived through mobility itself but through the encounters (with *Otherness*) that mobility yields, being ‘one of them,’ or with one with ‘them,’ means, in part, being permitted to share back regions with ‘them’ (MacCannell, 1999: 94). The attractions of the terrain and the encounters *proper* to it remain a ‘fundamental part of how people build a sense of self through travel’ (Oakes, 2006b: 236), those who take a tactical position investing their knowledge, skills and competencies seeking to create their own space, reacting ‘creatively and interpretatively to processes of commodification’ (Giddens, 1991: 199), even if that means avoiding people, attractions, food not seen as proper to a place.

While actualising only a few of the possibilities fixed by the constructed order, ‘… (by creating shortcuts and detours) and prohibitions (for example, he forbids himself to take paths generally considered accessible or even obligatory’ (De Certeau, 1988: 98). They fight against the touristic paraphernalia that robs ‘the trip of its spontaneity and of the experience of the ‘real’ life in the host society’ (Cohen, 1973: 95), the reflexive project of the self a ‘continual struggle against commodified influences’ (Giddens: 1991: 199) when the felt promise or possibility of action is restricted. Where actors feel no natural fit between their dispositions to believe (embodied capital) and an over-determined field, they feel ‘out of place’, their refusal to accept the world as it is given, inducing a lay reflexive and role-distance. Turning to their ‘own ends’ (De Certeau, 1988: xix-xx), they take what they have at their disposal to secure independence with respect to circumstances, their advantage being ‘time’, given they ‘must constantly manipulate events in order to turn them into opportunities’ (De Certeau, 1988). There is an impulse to discover the world in specific ways, bringing discomfort, inconvenience, risk, nuisance and labour into their lives and finding value in spaces outside the marked, proper and named places. Like de Certeau’s worker, these backpackers divert time to their own needs and engage in work that is ‘free, creative and precisely not directed toward profit’, taking pleasure ‘in finding a way to create gratuitous products whose sole purpose is to signify his own capabilities through his [or her] work and to confirm his [or her] solidarity with other workers or his family through spending his [or her] time this way’ (de Certeau, 1988: 25-26).

By ‘performing’ revolts, those who take a tactical stance seek a better ‘means of exchange
than property and money... another basis for human interaction’ (Abbie Hoffman in Jezer, 1993: 204), Cresswell (1993) noting how the ambiguous nature of mobility will always be suitable for creative subversion, from stopping longer, travelling more slowly or using ‘pre-modern’ transport. As speed is not the only pleasure of their mobility, they seek de-acceleration, slowness, desynchronised, localisation and more natural corporeal rhythms proper to the terrain, their quotidian rhythms at once a practice and experience (Borden, 2001). Practices from dumpster diving, train hopping to hitchhiking attempt to push out the boundaries that enframe them and give them room for manoeuvre, recovering ‘the world of difference - the natural, the sensory/sensual, sexuality and pleasure’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 50), as they re-create the scapes through practices that highlight endurance, skill, competencies, risk and knowledge. If one has an ‘adequate set of social tools in order to negotiate belonging’ (Walker, 2010: 617), such practices are about experiencing the scapes contours, zones, and boundaries in a more authenticating way, creating new ways of moving, dwelling nad communicating.

To travel powered by ones feet is considered more natural and organic, sleeping rough in parks and in tents signifies a more grounded approach to travel, the attraction to dark corners, street food and near uninhabitable accommodation closer to local people and culture (Cannon and Yaprak, 2002; Hannerz, 1996). Like the hippies, ‘[t]hey go out of their way to suffer the most extraordinary degradations’ (Mills, 1973: 170) as they use the scapes in cunning ways, their role distance and hesitancy in the conduct of everyday life, offering, in their opinion better affinity to the fields ethos. Bourdieu (1993) argues that the ‘degree of autonomy of a certain field is measured by its ability to reject external determinants and obey only the specific logic of the field’, and as landscapes are reshaped around ‘new transport and communications systems and physical infrastructures, new centres and styles of production and consumption ... and modified social infrastructures’ (Harvey, 1993: 7), backpackers will look for a new ‘symbol of solidarity’ (Hebdige, 1976: 93) with old symbols such as guidebooks and hostels criticised as a symbol of the lesser traveller (Sørensen, 2003).

While still receiving over 1,000 emails, letters and phone calls a month from travellers, there is less backpacker involvement in Lonely Planet guidebooks, and while hostels and
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147 Abbot Howard ‘Abbie’ Hoffman (November 30, 1936 – April 12, 1989) was a countercultural activist in the United States.

148 ‘Agents may engage in reasonable forms of behaviour without being rational; they may engage in behaviors one can explain, as the classical philosophers would say, with the hypothesis of rationality, without their behaviour having reason as its principle’ (Bourdieu, 1998: 76).

other mediating services have never been so widespread, these mediums find it difficult to
directly cater to a specific audience, the burden of the interpretation falling on backpackers
themselves. Once providing the individual with the tools for change, requiring a high level
of involvement and participation, Butcher (2003: 45) notes how Tony Wheeler, the Lonely
Planet founder, admitted meeting travellers who ‘used his guides to identify places to
avoid’. Along with the increasing penetration of ‘technological rationality, of
commodification and market values, and capital accumulation into social life’ (Harvey,
1993: 12), reflexive travellers are forced to (re)establish a sense of themselves over time,
that focuses on identification with alternative constructions of place, the ‘search for an
authentic sense of community and of an authentic relation to nature’ (ibid, 12). It is not that
these travellers continuously seek to use their mobility to ‘imagine themselves as those who
influence the direction of their own moves’ (Kesselring and Vogl, 2008: 169), but ‘the
seeing of space…depends on exploring and manipulating the environment’ (Gibson, 1950:
223) and they will use mobility to manipulate the scapes so as to engender encounters they
see as valuable and identity affirming.

They are very aware of the rhythms they seek to gain a foothold in, the objects, places and
people they can derive meaning from, potentially altering a touristic logic that ‘rests on the
volume of leisure experiences’ (Southerton, 2007: 118), the scapes, at least at its centre,
often (but not always) ‘an obstacle to certain forms of mobility which do not find a favorable
terrain for their realization’ (Kaufmann, 2002: 87). As the habitus includes the ‘permanent
capacity for invention’ (Bourdieu, 1990b: 63), those with a tactical stance continually seek
to generate partial revolutions, their perception of the scapes generating a relationship of
cognitive construction of their worth, where the ‘[h]abitus contributes to constituting the field
as a meaningful world, a world endowed with sense and value, in which it is worth investing
one’s energy’ (Bourdieu and Waquant, 1992: 127).

In a process of reterritorialisation, individuals can seek to solidify what had been fleeting
and ephemeral, to reinvent and reinvest ‘a transformation of practice and experience which
is felt actually within localities’ (Tomlinson, 1999: 9, original emphasis), new ‘technologies
of the self’ like couchsurfing.com helping inviduals to demonstrate autonomy and agency. I
argue like Bourdieu (1991: 232) that ‘the probability of mobilization into organized
movements, endowed with an apparatus and a spokesperson, etc.’ can bring dispersed
peoples together to forge affective alliances and intercultural affinities, providing access to
resources that might be experienced as personalised, authentic, capital intensive and
identity-enhancing, offering new perspectives on self-expression and experience of the scapes. I argue these backpackers often ‘play the game of free exchange, even if it is penalized .... exchange gifts; and in these ways we can subvert the law that, in the scientific factory, put work at the service of the machine, and, by a similar logic, progressively destroys the requirement of creation and the ‘obligation to give” (de Certeau, 1988: 28).

8.4 Technologies of the Self: Hospitality Exchange.

Technologies of the self (methods, tools, process and objects) from diaries, catalogues, vehicles to alternative press and guidebooks\(^\text{150}\) enabled the those who identified with the counterculture to constitute themselves, technologies not provided by societies, through which people could ‘police’ their ‘selves’ in society; but technologies made performable as a means to help individuals to fashion themselves in relation a world they identified and sought to belong. Online ‘identity work’ has become central to backpacking since the development of online applications like hotmail and Internet cafes in the mid-1990 (O’Regan, 2009), replacing older technologies such as notice boards, hostel guestbooks and diaries. Online tools can offer a medium for narrative self-publishing that can keep a particular narrative going one which can often be a fictive and illusionary ‘story’ about the self that lasts as long as the journey. Various ‘networked’ tools enable individuals to project, communicate and validate their position within the scapes, from blogs, group emails to interactions on social networking sites, tools bound up with self-presentation and impression management\(^\text{151}\). While backpacker mobilities have always been mediated through ‘technologies of freedom’ (buses, airplanes, guidebooks), we are only just beginning to explore what the notion of ‘mobility’ might mean when ‘mediated through computing and communications technologies’ (Green, 2002: 281). Research shows that the Internet and other mobile communications technologies are becoming increasingly integrated into corporeal travel practices (Wang et al, 2002; Wang and Fesenmaier, 2003), claiming territory by their very existence, acting as a platform for a diverse range of everyday activities, their use no longer limited to internet cafes but increasingly available while ‘on the go’. Much like the catalogues and alternative magazines of the 1960s and

\(^\text{150}\) Steward Brand started the Whole World Catalog in 1968 for those in the communes, establishing collaborative, intimate but geographically dispersed communities, enabling ‘its readers to transform themselves and their communities to the trajectory of American myth’ (Turner, 2006: 79). These catalogues were written by its readers through letters and product reviews, and in doing so, they asserted their own membership in a distributed network of counterculturalists. The last edition in 1972 sold more than a million copies.

\(^\text{151}\) Smith (2001: xxi) argues that ‘[i]f the mode of moving a body through space affects the traveler who moves through space as that body, then the mode of motion informs the meaning that the that the traveler sends back home in narration’.
1970’s and early virtual communities like ‘The Well\textsuperscript{152}, today’s technologies can be used to explore new social and spatial possibilities, backpackers with strongly held dispositions creating ‘over time their own context of action’ (Urry, 2003b: 101); providing dispersed individuals with tools to seek out and express identity, enabling them to position themselves as being in control of their self-image, constructing and shaping the way they see themselves and are seen by others. Nigel Thrift notes that the speed-up of information, communication and transport technologies has a shrinking and enlarging effect, enabling ‘people to travel and communicate more swiftly, thus bringing places closer together in time and rewriting the horizons of experience including notions of space’ (Crang and Thrift, 2000: 17) but also leading to an enlargement and widening of space and time, since people could now get a sense of other worlds and people beyond their previously known local one. The development of new social networking sites are increasingly replacing communities in print, new online tools providing opportunities for individuals with the pre-requisite capital to seek to represent their position more accurately in the scapes.

When in January 2004, Casey Fenton along with other (co) founders started Couchsurfing.com (CS\textsuperscript{153}, a social networking site or Internet based technosocial assemblage accessible over the Web with a Web browser, it facilitated new rules in the ‘game’, by tapping into embodied dispositions and the logic of the scapes, a ‘technology of the self’, described by Van Dijck (2007: 41) as ‘concomitantly technologies of sharing: they help form bonds…. tapping into communal or collective culture that in turn reshapes … identity’. The premise on the surface seems simple: if you need a place to stay, CS enables you to identify and find someone in a particular location to give sleeping space in his or her home for free. Rather than simply utilising the network because it offers ‘free’ accommodation, the site opens up lives of the guest and host. From its establishment, participation has not been market-based but user-led, its norms adhering to ‘the legitimate principles of the field’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 242). Established after Casey hacked into the University of Iceland student directory to spam 1,500 students with requests for advice and guidance for his trip to Iceland; mobility related encounters became the key foci from which the network has developed. Participants, who have the access, knowledge, ability and competencies all understand that participation will lead to face-to-face contact and prolonged intense interaction with other members, shaping the dynamics of the network.

\textsuperscript{152} The Whole Earth ‘Lectronic Link’, normally shortened to The WELL emerged in 1985, an imagined world (community) that emerged out of a countercultural imagination (Turner, 2006).

\textsuperscript{153} CS was not the first ‘hospitality exchange site’ (hospex), but it has become the largest, with membership currently standing just over one million.
and turning the hosts home into a ‘loci of affirmation’ (Gow, 2004), rediscovering the ‘power of cooperation, turning cooperation into a game, a way of life’ (Rheingold, 2000: 109). As merger of embodied (sub)cultural capital, social capital and communion, CS is neither online or offline, the process by which hospitality is ‘exchanged’ becoming a complex dance of face-to-face encounters, telephone calls and emails that ultimately leads to face-to-face contact and overnight stays (the average length of stay was 5.35 days in 2009).

Membership on CS is free although verification of personal details (real name and address) for a fee is encouraged. Like the majority of social networking sites, when an individual joins, they are required to build a semi-public profile, using their real name and address. The profiles, similar to those used on Facebook and MySpace serve as a digital representation of one’s identity, but unlike most networking sites, where you first connect to known others by ‘friending’ them, there is no function on CS that allows individuals to comment on other users’ profiles, to start ‘friending’, or to invite unknown others to view your profile. While Myspace and Facebook are primarily designed to sustain and maintain an already known network of (former) friends, colleagues and family, CS is made up of geographically dispersed strangers. The fixed profile categories require a real picture of the individual and are quite rigid, sparse and hospitality explicit, requiring users to highlight whether they can offer hospitality (couches, a coffee /drink), what they can offer and expect from guests, their language skills and past and future travel plans. While the profile allows users to express salient aspects of an identity (boyd, 2007, 2008), commitment to that identity can only be created and maintained through highly visible testimonials, vouches and (post-hospitality exchange) friend connections, obtainable by offline participation in the CS project. Once the hospitality exchange takes place, both the host and guest must rate the experience as positive, neutral or negative, as well write personal testimonials. These reputation testimonials or trust features are public to the whole community and serve to define the individual and their place within the project, directly influencing the possibility of users pursuing an offline social life through the site and improving ones ‘position’. Opening up new opportunities for action, their semi-public or public profiles allow the network to be articulated, developed and sustained within, across and between geographic and cultural borders and boundaries; a tool where the individual can maintain, develop and articulate relationships with other users within that system, explicitly stating their relationship in both a visible and browsable form. This enables them to argue that they have moved physically.
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154 In comparison to much of tourism where ‘commoditisation lies at the complex intersection of temporal, cultural and social factors’ (Appadurai, 1986:15)
155 http://www.couchsurfing.org/about.html
mentally and cognitively outside the backpacker role, learning the competence and skills to be comfortable with the Other, not simply while on the move but also in their home.

8.4.1 Couchsurfing: Mobility and Motility Capital.

CS forces us to rethink mobility (and backpacking itself), given that mobility can be a practiced, experienced, affective, imaginary, intellectual and embodied position. For backpackers who develop a set of dispositions (appreciations, perceptions) that encompass more than the capacity or ability to efficiently overcome physical distance, their subjectivity takes embodied form (Thomas, 1996). I agree with Goodson and Phillimore (2004: 40) who argue that the focus should not be on the destination, 'divorced from human subjectivity, but also on the subjectivity and the socio-historical and socio-cultural antecedents of such subjectivity'. Backpacking literature has argued that the capital accumulated in the scapes is difficult to sustain or convert upon the end of the journey, their dispositions not performable in the fields beyond which they originated. This is in comparison to the range of actions undertaken by gappers, WHM and volunteers whose practices can be seen as coded in relation to the dominant culture of their society, such as schools, parental taste, employers, universities or one’s own cultural and economic capital, reinstating a hierarchy consistent with the middle class, who desire capital which is durable, credential, institutionalised and transferable. Scholars have argued that backpacking has no little to no bearing on the way individuals continue their lives when they return to conventional jobs and education, their mobility restricted to imaginative travel (through images) and virtual travel (through information and communications technology) (Szerszynski and Urry, 2006). CS highlights how individuals might continue an active ‘construction and reconstruction of reality through interactions with others and the meanings they attach to various aspects of tourism’ (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004: 40), relationships that are neither ‘objective’ nor readily measurable. Like their predecessors (beats, hippies, drifters156), who combined relative immobility and travel, their subjective appreciations, thoughts, perceptions and actions are never fully constituted through spatial movement alone.

We need to think of dispositions as more than mere trivial addenda to lives as they often reflect within individuals at a particularly deep level, and continue to shape personal and cultural identities. Bourdieu described embodied cultural capital as ‘long-lasting dispositions

156 The Beats, Hippies, Hell’s Angels and New Age Travellers who after travelling the summer, ‘parked up’ (McKay, 1996) or returned home during the winter (Hetherington, 1992; 1998; Martin, 1998; Mills, 1973; Thompson, 1966) often in the company of others.
of the mind and body’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 243) and ‘implies a labor of inculcation and assimilation, costs time, time which must be invested personally by the investor’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 244); an investment that many are unwilling to let go. Bourdieu (2000) argued these dispositions might waste away or weaken through lack of use, but still work after the conditions of its socialisation have been dislodged (McNay, 1999), becoming part of the inner self ‘that tends to perpetuate itself into the future’ (Bourdieu, 1990a: 55) to reflect a distinctive way of being-in-the-world. Westerhausen (2002) found that eighty-five percent (85.2%) of his backpacker respondents felt travel changed them, their desire for movement was ‘in the blood’, their motivation to seek encounters, especially with like-minded others, retaining its value even when they returned home. The irreversible nature of the dispositions makes it difficult to return to ‘old paths’ (Giddens, 1991), many unable and unwilling to ‘reject the world of sociability which has been achieved by the interlinking of all peoples and places into a global economy’ (Harvey, 1996: 314), their deeply ingrained understandings and dispositions ‘not of the kind that can be suspended by a simple effort of will, founded on a libratory awakening of consciousness’ (Bourdieu, 2001: 39), their interpretation of the journey becoming part of the psyche, their ‘liminal performance [having the] potential of irrevocable self-transformation’ (Shaffer, 2004).

Until recently, there was no tool/medium capacious enough to speak on their behalf and to give them the discursive space to mobilise themselves and achieve biographic continuity across time-space and reinforce the marks of their subjectivity. The emergence of CS highlights how, in spite of lack of movement, reflexive individuals still have the capacity to sustain a way of life which feels ‘true to self’ (Hoare, 2006: 70), since the ‘limits of the field are situated at the point where the effects of the field cease’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 100). Since hospitality exchanges reconstruct reality through interactions with others, these encounters are directly linked to the transformation they feel they achieved from travel, using their acquired knowledge, skills, orientation and dispositions to recreate their world more accurately but only existing only for a subject ‘endowed with the aptitude and the inclination to establish the differences which are held to be significant in the social world under consideration’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 237). Maffesoli (1996: 39) argues that we need to rethink attributing sociality to a secondary place and ‘making of it … a frivolity’, since its central to identity. Whether its picking up hitchhikers or hosting guests for free, proximity
and sociality are engendered through mobility, with ‘people like themselves’\textsuperscript{157}, ‘the proximity of conditions and thus of dispositions tends to be re-translated into durable links and groupings, immediately perceptible social units such as socially distinct regions or districts (with spatial segregation), or sets of agents possessing altogether similar visible properties’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 237)\textsuperscript{158}. CS enables users to build motility capital (Kaufmann, 2002; 2004), transforming it only intermittently\textsuperscript{159} into mobility, enabling an individual to ‘take possession what is possible in the domain of mobility and build on it to develop personal projects (Flamm and Kaufmann, 2006; Kaufmann, 2002) congruent with self-identity. Building capital ‘through the compromises made between aspirations, projects and lifestyle’ (Kaufmann, 2002: 45), CS gives its participants access to a specific form of mobility depending on both their competence (to recognise and make use of access) and appropriation (involving all behavioural components).

CS does not force its users to choose between mobility and place attachment, no binary division existing between between elite classes of users moving at will and an immobile class of locals forced to service them. CS helps both hosts and guests to re-approach the local with the site helping ‘new forms of connection and mobility, and their potential to rework social relations and to re-construct localism’ (Savage et al, 2005: 3). Members can also use the site to connect with like-minded others in the same geographic locality in which they live, leading to regular proximity, intimacy and interaction through scheduled and publicly announced events. User organised meet-ups, publicly announced on-site\textsuperscript{160} take place in every town and city where there are two or more CS members residing. While primarily small and announced at short notice, larger events where members travel, dwell together in shared places for periods are also popular. Like hippies or new age travellers, CS’ers surround themselves intermittently with like-minded bodies in social settings, often employing out-reaching ‘in-yer-face’ temporary disturbance tactics as they transgress the routines and familiarities of everyday life. These public re-stagings challenge the representational settings (tourist attractions, non-places like airports, public and urban spaces), their practices of ten including activities like large-scale flash mobs (Rheingold, 2002), free hugs at railway stations or shopping streets, parties on metros, camping, BBQs,

\textsuperscript{157} While, they are not searching for the pre-modern Other, like Dean in \textit{On the road} who found ‘people like himself’ (Kerouac, 1957/1991: 280), hospitality exchanges offers a temporary liberation from what they believed is their over-developed life, their contact with the Other still believed to offer an uncontaminated, free, inventive, creative and spontaneous experience.

\textsuperscript{158} While not all members of CS are previous backpackers, the shared dispositions have usually been internalised through extensive mobility (educational exchanges, working abroad, migration).

\textsuperscript{159} Motility capital ‘may well be deliberately left temporarily in its status of potential in order to permit, for example, the maximum use of future opportunities’ (Flamm and Kaufman, 2006).

\textsuperscript{160} http://www.couchsurfing.com/meetings.html
walking tours or hitchhiking competitions. However, most exchanges are person-to-person, where ‘backpackers’ are given access to parts of their hosts surrounding locale as they perform the role of the insider, using their knowledge of the global ‘to present their glocal reality’ (Salazar, 2005), each member sharing a global belonging, by ‘localising’ a place for their visitors through help advice, stories, translation or history (Salazar, 2006) so as ‘to encapsulate the essence of place’ (Pond, 1993: vii cited in Salazar, 2006: 835). They often accompany ‘surfers’ to local places and ‘touristic’ attractions that they might not have previously visited, sharing details about their locality and their lives, often altering their daily routines (work, family) around the surfer’s needs, taking time out to cook or leave work early, making this cosmopolitan (global) part of their lives visible to others, their performance helping to demonstrate a reflexive relationship of engagement with the Other.

8.4.2 Couchsurfing and Social Capital.

I have considered backpacking through the concept of (sub)cultural capital where capital is accumulated in the process of playing the game, backpackers becoming invested in and absorbed by the game itself (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 98–100) where its objectified and embodied nature reflect their position within the scapes. This ‘road status’, however is not permanent, only lasting as long as it is worked on and communicated while journeying, ‘both in terms of asserting it, and in terms of defending the validity of its parameters’ (Sørensen, 2003: 858). Whatever the energy, time and effort applied, the capital generally disintegrates on the return home, with few ways to perverse it except in the way of souvenirs, guidebooks and memories. Within CS, however, the embodied (sub)cultural capital (the long lasting dispositions of the mind and body) can be invested as an asset and converted to social capital, which in turn brings economic, cultural and social benefits. Bourdieu (1986: 249-250) defines social capital as ‘the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalised relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word’. To return to Bourdieu’s game analogy, players will seek to both preserve and increase their capital according to the game’s tacit rules and conventions. CS partially changes the ‘immanent rules of the game’ and the ‘exchange rate between various species of capital’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 99) since it can be mobilised to better reflect their position, as it allows the individual to claim resources and tacit knowledge available to
the host and their networks, creating a window into that place.

The site is heavily dependent upon an unspoken, intuitive agreement about practices of exchange, embodied (sub)cultural capital facilitating the type of appropriate sociability, the capital accumulated by hosting recognised and transferable within the wider social network. While those who participate do so without a guarantee of a particular return; the capital invested through the site is leveraged and scaleable and can be recouped nearly anywhere in the world in the future, since it is accumulated, stored and communicated electronically for the benefit of the host, guest and the community at large. The capital becomes an advance calling card for the journey / future trips and can be transformed into maintaining an advantage within the scapes, establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long-term, transforming the contingent relations we associate with backpacking into relationships that are at once necessary and elective, implying durable obligations selectively felt (feelings of gratitude, respect, friendship) or institutionally guaranteed (rights) (Bourdieu, 1986: 250-251). While MacCannell (1999: 92) believes a separation exists in between front stages, ‘the meeting place of hosts and guests or customers and service persons’ and the backstage ‘where members of the home team retire between performances to relax and to prepare’, any attempt during a hospitality exchange to mask performances or ‘knowingly contradict’ the sites’ expectation for face-to-face interplay might lead to a negative reference. Participants are driven to fine-tune who they say they are, providing consistent narrative and patterns of behavior, both online and offline from hosting through to surfing, the continual endeavour of sociability requiring effective self-fashioning and self-monitoring, which in turn generates trust and intimacy.

Social capital is not located in the members themselves or one’s profile but in their relations with others, the couches, connections and reputations, which are visible to all, a permanent archive of past contributions and actions, a record of capital ‘acquired by means of a sort of withdrawal from economic necessity’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 54). They not only represent the individual, their dispositions, commitment, values and integrity but they also continually enable the individual to become ‘visible to themselves’ in the context of their mobility as well as their potential for mobility. Having risen out of the individualisation of self that might be used to express a subjectivity, CS has a ‘private’ and ‘public’ good (Putnam, 2001), incorporating both ‘bonding’ (interaction between like-minded people) and ‘bridging’ (inter-group links) social capital. Social capital mobilises the possibilities of the self in relation to the potentialities of the scapes, uncovering ‘hidden treasures’, but is only empowering with
the help of others. Rheingold (2000: 49) argues for the notion of a ‘gift economy’ in which people do things for one another out of a spirit of building something between them, less a product of the social control and more a product of trust within ties, ‘the spirit of reciprocity, sociability, and spontaneity … usually are starkly opposed to the profit-oriented, self-centered, and calculated spirit that fires the circulation of commodities’ (Appadurai, 1998: 11). Zygmunt Bauman in an interview with Adrian Franklin (2003b: 215) argues that the impulse that drives tourism has an energy that could be used for non-tourist impulses if individuals could learn and teach from each other. He argues that while the desire of individuals might be genuine, their impulse is milked by the tourism industry, ‘used up, channeled away squandered by the commercialized pseudo-multiculturalists… in lieu of genuine conversation or a real attempt to get an insight into other’s life and thought’.

8.4.3 Couchsurfing: House and Home.

Tourism, as a concept is largely based on the spatialisation of two contrasting nodes – home and away (Hui, 2008) but for the counterculture, these dualisms had broken down, the ‘heavy games’ of home life and conventional leisure were part of a system to be viewed with skepticism, ‘no more than a network of largely formal and empty relationships’ (Mills, 1973: 114). Neville (1970: 216) argues that the communal movement was reacting against Western style family ‘units,’ ‘[t]he Bank manager’s ideal family isolates one from another, ill-preparing its offspring for relating to the outside world’. Through the development of communes, they sought to minimise their dependence of ‘capitalist society’, marginalising the significance of money and purchased products (Lewis, 1973; Neville, 1970) but also seeking to redefine personal relationships by cementing and preserving relationships with those they felt had similar values (most like themselves). Mills (1973) notes how participants during the counterculture wanted to sustain relationships with others who had shared in the same ‘transformation’, believing they would be more creative, intimate and free. For members of CS, the site reorients the home, which has been progressively emptied of function, turned into a commodity, hospitality within a western context largely taken from the private home and replaced by institutionalised and commercial outlets (Heal, 1990). For Bauman (2003: 64) ‘[h]omes are no longer warm islands of intimacy amongst the fast cooling seas of privacy. Homes have turned from shared playgrounds of love and friendship into the sites of territorial skirmishes, and from building sites of togetherness into the assemblies of fortified bunkers’. Rather than mobility turning a home into a house, the site provides opportunities to enter into a network that can be used to
create 'home', but rather than being based on kinship, inputs incorporated into our everyday lives are based on affinity, trust and reciprocal exchange. Rather than leading to ‘[l]oneliness behind the closed door of a private room’ (Bauman, 2003: 64), for CS participants, the home is not a place to keep the world shut out and disconnected from the space of flows. Dobers and Strannengard (2002: 240) argue:

*When home is seen as a place, it is a fixed entity where the walls construct a physical boundary between in and out. When a home is seen as a space, it is a flexible, dynamic and mobile buffering zone around the inhabitant’s identity where dreams and emotions come alive.*

‘Home is not, in any event, a site of immobility’ (Clifford, 1997: 85) and when fluids get into ‘solid’ structures, soak through them, and potentially transform them’ (Sheller 2001: 14), turning suburbia, ‘an environment of few significant places … a placeless geography, a flatscape, a meaningless pattern of buildings’ (Relp, 1976: 117) into spaces of vital effluence. The home, even though it might be far more the city centre or attractions is a place, but simultaneously a space. While place implies proper, strategy and stability, space implies action, events and tactical movements from which spatial practices of everyday life can unfold. Rather than a fixed, immobile and physical entity constructed out of walls, the home as a space can help construct complex relationships and inspire new playful practices without intermediaries. The primary home, the location for many more or less ‘ordinary’ practices can be a very flexible, dynamic and ‘terminal’ (Urry, 2000a: 72), becoming a significant environment for backpackers, their self-induced mobility yielding encounters seen and felt as valuable. Participants identify themselves with others, forging a sense of belonging and attachment, injecting dynamism into the home and the private sphere, which often entails a temporary reversal of existing spaces for other identities and practices. This commitment and affirmation to mobility is a slice of oneself that runs very deeply within many of its users, some of who host hundreds of surfers per year. They argue they are being true to themselves, fashioning an authentic existence, their acceptance of guests in their home speaking to others (and oneself) about who they really are and what they hold to be valuable.

For surfers, the reoriented home offers a person-to-person encounter, connection and exchange that can only be considered as a product of place, as opposed to travel (Oakes, 2005). In this instance the home can be seen as representational space, the non-verbal
overlay on physical space, described by Lefebvre (1991a: 38-39; original emphasis) as ‘space as directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’, but also of some artists and … a few writers and philosophers, who describe and aspire to do no more than describe’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 38-39). Coded and ‘linked to the clandestine or underground side of social life’ (ibid, 39) that does not obey the rules of consistency or cohesiveness. It is re-imagined as subversive, lived, temporal representational space, where CS users come together to reestablish human bonds and form the basis for alternative imaginaries in an attempt to controvert the domination of the scapes and lived space by commodified practices. Lefebvre, (1991a: 42) argues that ‘[r]epresentational space is alive: it speaks. It has an affective kernel or centre: Ego, bed, bedroom, dwelling, house; or: square, church, graveyard. It embraces the loci of passion, of action and of lived situations, and thus immediately implies time’ and like the communes, the home is seen as ‘the best means of cementing and preserving certain important relationships’ in a straight society (Mills, 1973: 115).

8.5 Utopia Redux.

CS is not a utopia but engenders a ‘silo’ of like-minded individuals who seek only the ‘right proportion of genuine or pretended ‘otherness” (Franklin, 2003b: 213); demanding participants (including the Other) submit to the sites values. While the exchange is welcomed and voluntary, lending participants ‘for a time the appearance of solidarity’ (Bauman, 1993b: 235), the ‘truly’ immobile, the ‘locally tied’ are barred from such connections and are ‘doomed to stay local’ (Bauman, 2003: 98). Creating a ‘portfolio of sociability’ (Castells, 2001: 132), it offers a false sense of integration to reality (Mejías, 2006), tribal ‘sensation gatherers’ (Bauman, 1995: 123) that are ‘tourist always, in holidays and in daily routine … tourist everywhere, abroad and at home. A tourist in society, a tourist in life – free to do his or her own aesthetic spacing’ (Bauman, 1993b: 244), their status guaranteed by being able to traverse both its’ real’ and ‘virtual’ renditions (Bauman, 1998: 88). However, as backpackers push back ‘the limits of doxa and [expose] the arbitrariness of the taken for granted’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 169), their performative orientation toward the Other can challenge object-subject dualisms, since the surfer (often a foreigner) ‘is allowed to enter the host’s space under conditions the host has determined’ (Yegenoglu, 2003: 15), allowing them to ‘become’, in this case not someone else, but themselves as an ‘engaged, continuously re-created and situationally rooted persona’ (Shields, 1992: 107) leading them to believe that they are building something and are part of something bigger between them.
Valued encounters predicated on mobility and hospitality in the home enables those with the dispositions to imagine reciprocal obligations, coming to perceive what the ‘world has to offer and to provide us with enough energy to go and seek it’ (Hage, 2004: 28).

I argue ‘reflexive monitoring’ of self ‘forms a trajectory of development from the past to the anticipated future’ (Giddens, 1991: 75), dispositions of body and mind often remaining as an active residue of an individual’s life, determining how an individual acts and reacts to the world. Their exposure to the scapes suggests a mobility of mind where mobility can take place ‘without physically moving from one’s habitat’ (Braidotti, 1994: 5). I argued that self-identity is ‘reflexively understood by the person in terms of her/his biography’ (Giddens, 1991: 53), a reflexive project meaning individuals can maintain what they consider a more harmonious life, geared to a meaningful biographical narrative ‘across indefinite tracts of time-space’ (Giddens, 1991: 18), their ‘movement of self-stretching across time is the source of a person’s self-identity, in that the person one is now has a historical connection with the person whom one was yesterday’ (Thomas, 1996: 45). As a reflexive project of the self, individuals put to use ‘what one learns in relation to oneself, to one’s understanding of oneself’ (Illeris, 2004: 91), reflexively fashioning the self so as to keep a coherent, yet continuously revised, biographical narrative, going ‘in the context of multiple choices filtered through abstract systems’ (Giddens 1991: 6). It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to judge whether their practices are a reflection of individuals seeking to regain some of the feelings they felt on their journey, such as the feelings of transformation, belonging and feeling wanted or simply ‘intended solely to signify their own know-how by their work and to respond to the fellowship of workers with a gift’ (de Certeau, 1980: 4) and thereby becomes a tactic of subversion.

8.6 Chapter Summary.

While many fields are autonomous with their own internal logics, there is no doubt that backpacking influences (and is influenced by) by ‘non-synchronous, uneven relations with other fields’ (McNay, 1999: 106) from labour markets to local and national politics and media. The scapes like any other field are influenced by the demands of the capitalist system of accumulation, an interest that has seen economic, judicial and political actors take a greater interest in regulating particular ‘games’. While each country pursues its own policies, there is often a common approach to various global scapes and their regulation, whether they are foodscapes, seascapes or queerscapes and objects and people that flow
within them. Given that this world is characterised as a resource in social, political and economic discourses, regimes of control can seize on and capture the energies from unsettled bodies, the political machinery of representation seeking to produce particular kinds of idealised subjects amenable to be managed by power. Such a common approach was seen in the 1970’s, when authorities sought not to modify but to taint and damage the scapes, by making regulating power (police, borders) very real to those who sought to position themselves in them. Today, rather than seek to disrupt or destabilise them, governments and other bodies aim to preserve, manage, conserve and expand them and the backpacker label, by reframing the backpacker as a fixed corporeal identity whilst selling the scapes to capture the more contemporary, affluent and structured positions demanded by the ‘middle classes’ who depend upon the system of production to make appropriate cultural goods available. Harvey (2001: 89) argues how political interpretations can ebb and flow, but as policy makers and governments note backpackings’ economic rather than intercultural potential (especially in an economic downturn); negative characteristics and any ‘chains of implications’ often marginalised. This approval has enabled backpacking to flourish but at the risk of backpacker subjectivity being fixed, as the industry through cultural intermediaries (who constitute a differentiated sub-field of power) have worked alongside regulatory frameworks to categorise and institutionalise a travelling culture, extending the label into new sub-fields in order to keep up with a changing society, fixing identities and meanings that ‘proffer a particular understanding of the landscape as formal while thereby insinuating the deviancy of other meanings’ (Rajaram and Gryndy-Warr, 2007: xxv).

Academics, the tourism industry, planners, entrepreneurs, travel agents, hostel owners and governments seek the ‘right sort’ of backpacker, a role ‘fetishized as a thing, a product, a behaviour – but in particular an economic thing’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 6). They are only acceptable if they keep moving with any sense that individuals might cut loose, wander outside the scapes or are not fully fixed within its boundaries are subject to greater scrutiny from the scapes ‘stakeholders’ such as friends, family, co-travellers, businesses, immigration control, police officers and residents. The extension of the label (gappers, flashpackers, volunteers) offers the ‘new middle classes’ the centre of the scapes and provided them with ideological justification, moral support, legal protection and institutionalised and credentinial cultural capital. As a range of options become available, intermediaries increasingly determine what backpacking is by attributing particular values to particular practices, codifying the scapes as safer and less riskier, cancelling out ‘many
of the past limits to the magnetic power of ‘going places’” (Bauman, 2003: 61). In the process of making the label productive, the individual backpacker has increasingly become a ‘dividual’ (Deleuze, 1992), counted, stereotyped, typeset, idealised, described and characterised by means of rational and practical forms of mobility calculation and compliance.

These extended positions have re-created the cultural economy of elitism since they are infused with particular meanings, as stakeholders appeal and respond to existing social boundaries, offering the ‘new middle classes’ identification and affordances for individuals to deploy their economic and cultural capital, putting them in potentially more powerful positions in the scapes. Defining their ‘taste’, through ‘classificatory struggles’, the new middle classes have appropriated subjectivities for their own aesthetic and social ends, helping to ‘stroke up on cultural capital’ (Munt, 1994: 109), often adopting a ‘grazing’ behaviour as they move from identity to identity within a single trip. They do not need to invest in cultivating a secondary habitus or incorporate and enact a new mental / cultural schema and by re-contextualising backpacking (and notions of class distinction) through new positions, a vast array of formal sectors can extract ‘residual cultural capital’ (Thurlow and Jaworski, 2006) as a means for profit, facilitated by regulatory and legal frameworks in receiving countries who in return receive guarantees of visa compliance161 together with financially independent, healthy, young, single and mobile individuals. Whether it is a two-week tour of Scotland, a month working in a school in Malawi or an overland tour across the Sahara, regulatory and societal approval can provide enhanced aesthetic meaning for the middle classes who move ‘in accordance with public opinion’ (Albertsen and Diken, 2001) and who are willing to pay a premium price ‘to acquire the cachet of identity that they confer’ (Hudson, 2005: 180). However, even with these sub-fields, there is still a seduction to the backpacker habitus, even for those in extended positions, its signifiers (independence, autonomy, thrift) seductive since those with a mobile subjectivity, those adeptness at managing multiple landscapes mean, they must also bear its additional economic costs.

Cohen (1995, 2004) argues that the modern backpacker has lost interest in intrapersonal authenticity (gaining one’s true self through bodily feelings and self-making) and interpersonal authenticity (gaining true human relationship through communitas (Kim and

---

161 Of the 123,045 Working Holiday Maker arrivals in Australia whose visas ceased in the 2005–06 reporting period, 99.4% were visa compliant (http://tinyurl.com/yfgbogf).
developing few skills, applying less effort and not travelling in experimental or existential mode\(^{162}\). However, I argued that the habitus provides backpackers with a system of ‘dispositions, schemas, forms of know-how and competence’ (Crossley, 2001: 83), the accumulation of embodied (sub)cultural capital existing in the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body. These dispositions become productive contexts, from where meaningful activities are continually sought; the value backpackers place on sociality, sharing and intimacy with the Other seen as self-actualising, empowering and proper to the terrain, entailing an intellectual openness and an ‘ability to make one’s way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting’ (Hannerz, 1996: 103).

The ‘search for contrasts rather than uniformity’ (Hannerz, 1996: 103) leads (tactical) backpackers to expose themselves to the scapes ambiguities, even though the ‘assumed world’ of the scapes does not allocate any ‘position’ for the Other, unable to write their stories on the landscape unless they are rooted, bounded, authentic and immobile. Even with their professed competencies and exploitation of opportunities, the most immersive of travellers find it difficult to impress their mastery with or through the Other, speed impacting on the possibility for meaningful encounters and social bonding. I argued however, that few modern reflexive subjects hold onto ideas and images concerning the pre-modern lives of local people (Tucker, 2003), backpackers using learned skills, knowledge to search for ‘authenticity of, and between, themselves’ (Wang, 1999: 364) by inscribing objects, transports, food and places with meaning, each backpacker having their own peculiarities with regards their own subjective production of locality. Using the example of CS, I note how ‘technologies of the self’ can reveal their position, one of the many intersecting social networks with a ‘family resemblance’ that allow individuals to be ‘true to oneself and one’s world’ (Obenour, 2004: 3), delivering on ‘pledges that they have already made to themselves about themselves’ (Miller and Slatter, 2000: 217), coming together ‘around and through individuals’ embodiments and subjectivities’ (Holt, 2008: 238). By reclaiming reciprocity, hospitality and sociality on a person-to-person basis through mobility, the home becomes ground for exposure, intimacy and emotional attachment, the hospitality exchange transaction seen as an affirmation where ‘people do things for one another out of a spirit of building something between them’ (Rheingold, 1996: 425), concuring a vital

\(^{162}\) Cohen (1979) described those tourists in experimental mode as engaged in a quest for an alternative experience in many different directions, while those in existential mode could be described as being fully committed towards the sacred or ‘spiritual’ centre, embracing the world of the Other as real and fulfilling.
space for self-expression, and enabling a ‘truer’ sense of self to emerge publicly with the help of others (Dervin and Abbas, 2009).

The concept of mobility has broken down divisions and highlighted tourism’s hybrid nature, breaking away ‘as a relatively minor and ephemeral ritual of modern national life to become a significant modality through which transnational modern life is organized’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 6), tourism no longer bounded off as a discrete activity, taking place in some ‘other’ place ‘contained tidily at specific locations and occurring during set aside periods’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 6-7), as internalised dispositions are actualised upon their return home, embedding those dispositions from their journey forward in a ‘straight’ society to expose the importance of mobility to valued (inter)relationships, interactions and socialities. CS highlights the weakness of many of the dualisms we associate with tourism / backpacking since embodied capital in the form of a habitus is ‘ready at any time to be awakened anew by an active association’ (Husserl, 1997 [1948]: 122). While all individuals possess multi-faceted identities, these dispositions are manifested when the host (request) arrives in the inbox or participation at a hitchhiking and/or CS gathering (dwelling, travelling and communicating). As individuals successfully ‘manage’ their ‘fractured habitus’ incorporating dispositions attained through participation in various worlds, they can ‘play up’ or ‘downplay’ particular aspects of their identity ‘in certain contexts and different aspects thereof in other contexts’ (Morrissey, 2009: 221), their participation in CS dependent on the stability and strength of the socialisation into the scapes and the frequency in which the habitus is actualised (Lahire, 2003).

As the present is deeply informed by the past, dualism’s noted in table 4 such as public-private, insider-outsider, modern-traditional, sacred-profane, authentic-inauthentic, mobility-immobility, virtual-physical, host-guest, home-away, proximity-distance, presence-absence, traveller-tourist, everyday-holiday, beaten track-off-the-beaten track, us-them and near-far no longer apply in the way they once did, since they are unable to account for the complex interplay between global patterns of mobility that bifurcate within a mobility continuum. These distinctions over-emphasised the distinctness and exoticness of tourism / backpacking and the pre-modern immobile places populated by ‘insiders’ or locals’ (Crang, 2006: 54), with McRae (2003: 237) noting how tourism studies need to get beyond the conventional definitional frameworks ‘most obviously those that rely on aggressive dominant/resistive models of tourist/host engagements’, following ‘[t]he implicit patterns of victim and perpetrator’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 9).
Table 4: New boundary crossing demonstrates complex interrelationships and transnational activity, where dualisms such as the following no longer apply in the way they once did.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insider</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Immobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>Guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>Inauthentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred</td>
<td>Profane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten track</td>
<td>Off- the beaten track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>Producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td>Far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locomotion</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>Apathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines of escape</td>
<td>Striated space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal networks</td>
<td>Community networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CS and other practices such as hitchhiking, dumpster diving and freeganism highlight the hidden power (away from the motel/hotel circuits, tourist offices) of the local in a global borderless world (Beck, 2000; 2008) and the disappearing logic of dualism's, given the motivation, desire and ability to cross them is increasingly possible. I am not arguing that
CS reclaims the local, reverses the tourist gaze and unmasksthe tourism industry but I do argue that as more sub-fields of restricted production emerge, individuals are likely to be weaved more deeply into the scapes, whether they are at home or on the move, sub-fields which ‘binds all social agents, whether they like it or not, to the social world of which they are, for better or worse, the products’ (Bourdieu, 2000: 173). I argue those who have travelled on the edge of the scapes, spatial influences can incline them to accept different cultures and viewpoints, ultimately leading to demonstrate their becoming in new networked ways once they return home.
Chapter Nine: A situated and partial bricolage.
9.1 Introduction.
I argued throughout this dissertation that globalisation has brought change on many levels, with metaphors of mobility increasingly used to explain a moving world, with objects, dangers, people, ideas, images, knowledge, information, symbols and capital circulating as complex imaginative, physical, geographic and virtual flows; underpinning social, material, political, economic and cultural processes including ‘perspectival’ landscapes, which I argued can become larger ‘imagined worlds’ (communities), worlds where In the context of this dissertation, can be seen as an set of landscapes, values, practices, and expectations regarding the way people (should) move, act and interact. I argued that mobility can be born out of choice, fate or compulsion, from everyday practices of moving through public spaces to commuting, encompassing desired movement for pleasure, work and leisure to those movements generated, coerced and forced because of war, famine, climate change and /or economic necessity. Scholars have taken up the challenge of incorporating insights from complex mobilities, making visible framings such as commuting, Diaspora, transience, transnationalism, migration, dislocation, liquidity and fluidity. The New Mobilities Paradigm (NMP) has helped to bring these framings into the centre of lively debates, forcing social theorists, politicians and activists to think again about the nature of movement and the profound impacts that communication, transport technologies and other local/global processes such as climate change, warfare and poverty have on patterns of (international) circulation and ultimately peoples, cultures, societies and places. For modern subjects, the capacity to move and to circulate is now essential for modern living, with those in control of their mobility seeking biographical exits from a socially concocted mess (Blackshaw, 2002), while those less in control are often assigned mobility or unable to move at all. Beck (1994: 13), when referring to the individualisation of the life course, argues, that ‘individuals must produce, stage and cobble together their biographies themselves ... the individual is actor, designer, juggler and stage director of his own biography, identity, social networks, commitments and convictions’.

While the term ‘tourist’ in contemporary understandings is value laden and imbued as culturally derogative and negative (Fussell, 1982; McCabe, 2005), their ‘mobility’ seen as simply brute movements to a attraction / destination and back, I argued tourism research largely fails to acknowledge how perspectival (cultural) landscapes can be used as a vehicle to construct identities and affiliations with others outside one’s immediate social circle or even nation. These landscapes, I argued, provide space for different encounters,
role-play, performances and experiences, imagined worlds (communities) whose space and time limitations can be conceptualised as a performance space for desires, providing for new aspirations, projects and lifestyles. Tourism studies have little or no regard for the interconnectedness of social spaces in generated landscapes, where mobility provides for the productive context for socialisation into new subjectivities. I have argued that we are only beginning to acknowledge how individuals can reposition themselves spatially, temporally and socially within worlds, building skills, knowledge and competencies, which can form a stable investment of meaning and a deepening of the self through concerted work on the self (Glennie and Thrift, 1996). For Hetherington (2000: 83) ‘[p]eople want to know that they are part of something larger like that they also want to know where it is they fit in’. As individuals ‘consciously sheds layers of his old self’ (Cohen and Taylor, 1992: 136), the transformation of identity often invokes a controlled disintegration or subjugation of old values as they induce control over their mobility to embody a ‘reflexivity organized trajectory of the self’ (Giddens, 1991). While participation in such worlds can be temporary, including those who only have the ‘most precious weeks of the year’ (Terkessidis and Holert, 2006), I argue that individuals are able to ‘live ‘in’ the world of modernity much more comprehensively than was ever possible before the advent of modern systems of representation, transportation and communication’ (Giddens, 1991: 211). The increasing sense that we live in a ‘global ecumene’ (Hannerz, 1991) has generated new ways of belonging, new global imagined worlds (communities) that attract deterritorialised viewers from around the world. As people increasingly move beyond ‘naturalized conceptions of spatialised ‘cultures” (Gupta and Ferguson, 1992:16), these new worlds often demand corporeal articulation and an embodied spatial experience with others, where exposure to a spatial, temporal, social and metaphoric journey through connected spaces of value are constituted by the historically situated imaginations of persons spread across the globe (Appadurai, 1996).

This dissertation looked at one of the many imagined worlds (communities) that emerged out of a countercultural imagination, one centered on mobility where the undertaking of ‘a particular form of travel, in a particular style’ (Edensor, 2001: 74) is required in its articulation. I argued backpacking constitutes one such imagined world, one build through a countercultural way of seeing and doing, built on a ‘mobility fantasy’ as dispersed individuals with different backgrounds and expectations used movement as a vehicle to explore new subjective experiences as they ‘drifted’ east in the 1960’s. I argued this journey over ‘borderless’ territories created a world that had ‘its own laws that
transcend[ed] the historical experiences of singular individuals’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 11), a world whose terrain had to be experienced for oneself. It was a world that soon became mapped and ‘performable’, the movement of bodies and information creating paths of individuals over landscapes, sustaining mobilities (and immobilities) that resonated in niche media across the western world as emblematic of a countercultural experience. Emerging as an autonomous field, largely independent of the tourism industry and the economic actors who could find no value in it, I argued the mass media soon objectified the ‘drifter’ and the overland scene as an unproductive assemblage of objects, ideas, hosts and buildings, stripping this emerging world of any worth or economic value. Once political, economic and social cooperation was withdrawn, the mechanisms by this world reproduced were curtailed, even though in terms of ideological continuity, it lived on in texts, movies and other representations.

I argued governments held stigmatising attitudes about this world remained throughout the eighties given the low-status position that the hippies / drifters had occupied in the social hierarchy, the world only seeing only significant growth when the tourism industry demystified the backpacker label in the 1990’s, becoming understood with reference to an internal-external dialectic of identification (Jenkins, 1996: 145-159). Remaining loyal to the same logic as the drifters, the relabeled backpackers were recast through leisure-driven touristic (educational) discourses, meaning their mobility could nown be justified. Serving to give a shot in the arm in the arm of a global tourism economy coming out of stagnation, this world’s realignment and repositioning was not unwelcome, imposed or sudden, with most governments, guidebook publishers and even academics eager to suggest these ‘long-term budget travellers’ were now as likely to be middle class, college educated and temporary ‘tourists’. The backpacker was now someone that governments, media, parents, and other interested parties could understand, categorise and allow to circulate. I argued that is still a position that geographically dispersed individuals can aspire to, as individuals primarily from the west inscribe this position with considerable meaning; a second birth where a subjectivity can emerge in enhanced contact and encounters that only this world can offer, encounters that only mobility can yield, their movement through dispersed locations articulating a position that offers its carrier the continual hope and expectation of transformation, autonomy and renewal. By relooking at this world through through the NMP, I argue the concept of imagined worlds (communities) offers a new way of looking at a world on the move, where global media, technologies of mobility and the power of imagination offer new attachments and belonging. I argue this dissertation offers a new
way of looking at backpacking, one world born out of a countercultural imagination, one that still resonates to this day.

9.2 Old Worlds: New Way’s of Looking.

This dissertation sought not to create new typologies or present ‘new’ findings, but following Silverman (1997: 251), ‘[w]e owe it to our audience to surprise them by inviting them, with great clarity, to look anew at the world they already know’ by recognising the backpacker as representing a subjectivity in progress, where geographically dispersed individuals become socialised and spatialised actors within landscapes that demand competent performances. I argued that many individuals who enter this world decide to suspend quotidian existence and ‘enter a fugue state in which normal behaviour and identity are reversed’ (Ostwald, 2001: 192). I found that previous research has had inbuilt intellectual limitations, often characterised by a refusal to enter ‘fully’ into the imaginative, looking down ‘like a god’ (de Certeau, 1988) and having difficulty grasping backpackers lived reality, few researchers seeking to connect its inhabitants with a learning trajectory and a broader autobiographical narrative. Because few researchers wish to become socialised through and into this world, they find it difficult to understand the practical and spatial logic that drives backpackers from place (sensation to sensation), often arriving with pre-defined criteria as to whom backpackers should be, where they should be and what they should be doing, even though they may have never have previously backpacked themselves. The NMP suggested new ways of thinking about a world that has spatial, social and temporal dimensions; encouraging me to follow innovative and radical lines of enquiry, cross theoretical borders and capitalise on progress made in other fields and disciplines. It demanded me to look at this world not simply as ‘tourism’ but as a complex and highly fluid social construction of reality, examining how this construction has developed and takes place, and how the parts intermesh the way they do. Rather than think of it as a ‘no-work, no-care, no-thrift situation … devoid of deeper meaning’ (Cohen, 1979: 181) it can be considered a form of ‘serious leisure’, each backpacker an active agent, their more hedonistic practices often hiding their considerable investment, belief and commitment to a world that offers second birth to those that seek it, with quite remarkable
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163 Bourdieu (1984: 54) argues the seriousness needed to play the game is a ‘playful seriousness’, without getting so involved in the game; that they ‘abandon the margin of neutralizing distance that the illusio (belief in the game) demands’. Berger (1990: 459) argues that while one might belong to many worlds ‘the mind has then to remain tentative and provisional in its commitment to imaginary worlds if it to avoid being trapped or paralyzed within the pool of Narcissus. The imaginary world must be made secure for the systole of withdrawal but not secure enough to discourage or prohibit the diastole of return’. He argues there is ‘the temptation to make it [imagined world (community)] absolutely autonomous, a perfect and eternal retreat’ is always present, the individual giving themselves ‘to the second world without forgetting that it is second, not first’, where individuals ‘delight in deepening knowledge, experimenting’, worlds now generating their own literature, traditions and even academics!
powers of self-stabilisation. Berger (1990: 459; original emphasis) argues serious playing ‘serio ludere’ means playing seriously with full knowledge; however seriously you play, you are only playing. It is ‘only a game,’ but a game, which (like all games) is to be played or taken dead seriousness while it is going on. Carefully framed within this attitude, the mind may abandon itself with intensity to the pleasure or seriousness of its second world’. Lefebvre (1991b) argues that:

‘human beings always behave like mystifiers, who manage to ‘play a role’ precisely by exaggerating their own importance. Sometimes the acting is crude, sometimes extremely subtle; and moreover the actor becomes committed, compromised; it is serious business. The parts must be acted out until the end; they are not pure roles, which an actor can give up when he is tired or when he feels he is acting badly. They extend reality, and are equally as real; acting explores what is possible; in the abstract, play-acting does not exclude sincerity; on the contrary, it implies it, while at the same time adding something extra – something real; the knowledge of a situation, an action, a result to be obtained’.

Instead of seeking grand theorisations, I utilise a bricolage strategy that draws upon the NMP for guidance, an approach that doesn’t favor a fixed paradigm and method but demands a range of conceptual / theoretical approaches. As ‘various paradigms’ interbreed (Lincoln and Guba, 2000) and disciplinary and methodological boundaries dissolve ‘between the personal and the professional, self and other, theory and experience’ (Galani-Moutafi, 2000), I drew on multiple methods to observe and participate in their world, to appreciate the compromises and tensions, the voices and the many facets, the strengths and fragilities of a social vehicle on which tens of thousands of human beings, in oving from sensation to sensation, now depend. Spending seven months backpacking, I blended interpretive / participatory paradigms so as to enliven knowledge and offer conceptual and theoretical advancement, ‘bracketing’ (Lynch, 1993) my researcher role so as to study the methods, talk, interactions, strategies and tactics through which backpackers sustain, manage and reproduce their world. Using immersive and complete participant observation but incorporating a reflective (thinking) aspect, the ‘researcher-as-interpreter bricoleur’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000) is ‘more or less’ a participant and ‘more or less’ an observer, my position on the continuum determining the reaction to events, activities, practices and encounters. I argued many researchers who immerse themselves as short-term participants become lost, unable to see everyday life in this world as normal and natural, where common taken-for-granted experiences, beliefs, and practices seen as strange, mysterious and slightly insane, since ‘the meaning of an action is different depending on the point in time from which it is observed’ (Schutz, 1967 [1932]: 65).
Once you see and feel this life as natural, you can step back as an observer and think ‘historically and interactionally’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000: 1019-1020) about observed and participated in practices. The social scientist, ‘with his or her access to scientific knowledge and methodologies, is able to transcend common-sense knowledge (within the confines of his or her investigative endeavor) to interpret social facts and human actions in relation to objective structures that are normally unavailable to actors’ (Throop and Murphy, 2009: 197). For this to happen, we must first approach the participant end of the continuum, become engrossed and immersed in what we seek to observe before seeking to make sense of the world, stepping back to reverse ourselves and ‘put distance between ourselves and the behavior of others’ (Richardson, 1980: 217). The act of writing in particular has been central to this dissertation, reflection helping to fashion ‘meaning and interpretation’ (Denzin, 2009: 34). After three periods of participation and distance, Bourdieu’s ‘theory of practice’ became a very useful tool to allow me to think about the way ‘backpacking’ operates. Peillon (1998) believes the usefulness of Bourdieu's framework will be decided by the way it makes sense of practices and institutions observed by the researcher. His concepts of field, habitus and capital were developed and used as a conceptual / theoretical scaffold for the analysis of their social world, a world where ‘practices emerge and (re)make the world that makes them’ (Bourdieu, 2005b: 136). Rather than seeking to come to grips with the apparent contradictions of varying backpacker actions, which have continually led to new typologies, categories, binaries and dualisms, I ‘locate’ backpacking in backpackers conscious and beyond conscious repetitive, ritualised beliefs, norms, practices and performances that constitutes their sense of the world, even though members are often unaware of many of the values that bind them together or are unable to verbalise them. In a major departure from tourism studies and research on backpacking, I argue backpackers can be theorised from the concept of habitus, ‘a site for the reproduction of the belief in the reality of a given social field — a belief by which that field is sustained’ (Butler, 1997: 155), their socialisation into this world generating a set of dispositions that generates very different practices, a mode of existence that is embodied and actualised in reductive landscapes (travellerscapes) they claim as their own. I argue that positioning oneself in this world can be taken on as a reflexive project of the self, collectively orchestrated ‘without being the product of the orchestrating action of the conductor’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 72) with individuals working constantly to achieve a meaningful, patterned everyday life and position in the field.
9.3 The Backpacker Habitus.

I argued that backpacking is sustained and reproduced through a agency driven habitus, but rather than a schematic product of an over riding middle-class upbringing, a habitual socialisation (rite of passage) enabled by parents to facilitate networking and stepping up the social mobility ladder, it is a reflection of strategic intention, an individual voluntary orientation towards an imagined world (community). I argued inhabitation of this world provides no access into the elevated social classes (Munt, 1994), while the generative economic, social and cultural capital of one’s upbringing or knowledge of tourist cultures (Löfgren, 2002), provides no ‘pre-reflexive, infra-conscious mastery’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 19) or god-like knowledge of the state of play. I argued that not all those that pursue a ‘feel for the game’ will become attuned to its doxa, the unwritten ‘rules of the game’ that are embedded in the context of the landscapes, many not staying long enough to internalise its norms as a set of dispositions. Moreover, I argued the socialisation process starts long before the journey itself, the principles and philosophies that embody the world made explicit in the public imagination and as they pass through movies and stories, its regularities, meanings and values very visible at least in the west rather than hidden as part of a shadowy globalisation. Born out of a countercultural imagination, the logic of this world was initially drawn from an admixture of elements and various discourses (i.e. ways of representing) and genres (i.e. ways of inter/acting) to form a specific way of being), one not fully incorporated within contemporary society and economic systems, its purposelessness now supplanted by the more ‘acceptable’ and structured positions such as overland tour, volunteer or gap year. The concept of habitus enables us to think more deeply about a social formation that exists across borders, the scapes generating dispositions that provide individuals with a sense of belonging, making some practices significant and others problematic. Bourdieu (1977: 167) states ‘when the conditions of existence of which the members of a group are the product are very little differentiated, the dispositions which each of them exercises in his practice are confirmed and hence reinforced both by the practice of other members of the group … and also by institutions which constitute collective thought as much as they express it’. The habitus allows backpackers to main relationship with other backpackers, even though the adaptation of their social and spatial environment is continually changing through a constantly evolving membership.

I argued that this habitus is a ‘socialized subjectivity’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 126) their movement through and encounter with a range of peoples, places, objects and
cultures (social, cultural, economic, political spaces) requiring bodily, emotional and thoughtful encounters and emotions which can’t be planned for, engaging the ‘whole-body’ and requiring the individual to ‘learn bodily’, putting their body on the line, which can manifest itself in dress, speech, eating habits, clothes and the way of looking and belonging. Individuals undergo a mental, bodily and physical transformation given bodies are continually exposed to other backpackers, structures, systems and spaces. Learning is inseparable from the agents’ social practices and so the ‘agent, activity and the world mutually constitute each other’ (Lave and Wenger, 1991: 33), the circulation of particular persons, ideas, objects, images and knowledge giving rise to a social formation; whose dispositions become fostered over time-space, and bodies become primed to act in different ways. Learning, embedded within activity, context and culture propels them into a condition of identity and congruence with the ‘travellerscapes’ and the ‘collective’ since these practices are more than physical practices, but are also signifying practices, an assemblage which constitute a performance (dispositions are both the outcome of such practices). The journey can be transformative over time but depends on free association and ‘friction’ during movement, continuing until ‘moving bodies … are folded into the world’ (Simonsen, 2008: 18), revealing and making visible the practices and bodily aesthetics we relate to this world. While individuals enter this world for a variety of reasons, responding to it in different ways, as participants they come to feel themselves to be connected and engaged with it. The socialisation process generates a certain competence, knowledge, skill and reflexivity as individuals are required to make choices on their own behalf, the process continuing as long as the journey, the habitus never fixed or completed. Their bodily movements embody a sense of place, their narratives believable as they recall stories about places they’ve been to, things they’ve done, people they met or where they are going next, their shared dispositions and affinities making them very open to each other, their narratives only readable and understandable by those have invested in the game or are inspired / seduced by it. These shared narratives with other backpackers make the scapes habitable and believable, the temporality and spatiality of narrative installing how ‘memories and expectations intersect in present dispositions for action and the constitution of spatial imageries’ (Simonsen, 2008: 21).

I argued that the habitus has a depth and breadth164, ‘a subtle hierarchy, borne of fierce snobbery headed by those who believe themselves to be hardcore real travelers and
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164 While doxa might not be entirely shared by all those who participate in this world, the parameters for acceptable behaviour are governed by the extent to which it overlaps among those interacting. Walker (2010) argues practice inscribed within shared fields conforms to agreed norms while practice that do not, will not.
filtering down to the cut-them-and-they-bleed-tourist blood minions’ (Fitzgerald, 2000: np). Backpackers, I argue become locked into relations of conflict and cooperation, as they constantly renegotiate and rework their relations, not merely searching for authenticity of the Other, but searching the authenticity of, and between, themselves (Wang, 1999). (Sub)cultural Capital is a moving target in a fluid and contested field, its status, value and worth, murky and constantly twisting, turning, and changing, as various actors fight, cooperate, collaborate and negotiate, an interplay that requires moments of fixity and movement, moorings and mobilities seeping and informing each other. Using de Certeau's concepts of strategy and tactics and Goffman’s theory of role commitment, I argued this depth and breadth can be seen as a continuum, wherein at one end, strategic carriers use space to accumulate objectified capital, while at the other, tactical carriers use time, accumulating and using embodied capital to seek status and position. I argue the habitus is not singular and rule-bound, with Crouch (1999: 12) noting how the ‘subject plays an imaginative, reflexive role’ as the ‘subject bends, turns, lifts and moves in often awkward ways’, the scapes having enough diversity, and are fluid, uneven and provisional enough to allow position taking.

Initially, individuals will navigate socially their subjectivity in progress, an active subjectivity, where one must first objectively collect the scapes through by near cartographical convention, before one performs the scapes not for others, but oneself. For those with a strategic stance, there is near doxic acceptance, the dispositions that both shape habitus and (and are shaped by it) informing behavior and general conformity of social action, constructed on the basis that individuals will participate collectively in the same events, rituals and experiences ‘often through mimetic representations thereof, and thus necessarily (and expectedly) sharing doxa so similar as to be effectively identical and collectively held’ (Walker, 2010; original emphasis). Tactical backpackers are very involved in the game and seek to mobilise their competencies, knowledge and skills to struggle against labeling and ascribed discourses as they utilise cracks and opportunities, while those with a strategic intent initially seek out other backpackers, sticking to the centre of the scapes like alcoholics, pouring themselves into ‘one role’, ‘believing that the predictability and regularity of a role could cure their injuries’ (Goffman, 1952: 461). Relying on the accumulation of objectified capital as a means of narrative capital, they reduce ambivalence and impose orderliness by tending to coalesce around those that have similar characteristics (age, ethnicity, gender), traversing in the centre of the scapes where they seek to embody dispositions that underpin a patterned nature of collective activity,
behaving willingly in accordance with the prevailing standards and generating practices that have a visible and harmonised coherence, the assemblage of which constitutes a performance. Individuals are faced with a multitude of choices as they move through a range of social, cultural and physical contexts – the parameters for action both enabled and constrained by active dispositions that generate practice (habitus both produces and is produced by practical action). These active dispositions underpin their belonging to movement and those others on the road, practical actions over time leading them to develop a sense of belonging, a belonging in a world build on social knowledge. It not that new backpackers learn the ‘rules’ from backpackers already in the scapes, each backpacker ‘are neither mechanistic puppets nor calculating game players’ (Banson et al, 1991: 39-40), but socially learning and participating together. Over time, they acquire dispositions through interacting with the ‘social and material (especially the human-made) environment, which consists of other people acting out of these dispositions and the material effects of such actions in the world’ (Lemke, 1995: 28). and where backpackers early in their journey are often awkward, over time, they become become more competent. In a non-linear process, individuals consciously and beyond consciously internalise dispositions, which when embedded in the reflexive (conscious) and the non-reflexive (beyond conscious) realm of individual activity and patterns of behavior, leading to a durable nature that perpetuates discursive practices and the (re)production of the scapes, their relationship with the scapes embodied, shaping responses and directing actions / performances in a way that will reinforce these dispositions and are significant on making sense in a fluid, uneven world.

This constructed identify is not solid and must be continually performed, performances through which individuals are able to feel, think and rethink (Crouch, 2003), their continual encounters and ongoing flow of subjective experiences forcing backpackers to continually reappraise, reinterpret and evaluate the self and actions as well as the conditions of their existence. I argued that over time, backpackers have the ability to reflect upon the nature of the social world and their position in it, a constant dance between certainty and uncertainty, mobility and immobility, between security and risk lived out continually until individuals construct their own understanding of their social world and their place in it. Fashioned on an ongoing basis as individuals move across the social field, this repositioning is both conscious and beyond conscious and over time might influence perceptions of the field in which the individual finds him or herself, the self, first and foremost, a cognitive
construction that develops over time. As capital is accumulated, particular cognitive abilities mean individuals can develop an awareness of the possibility of multiple perspectives of the same event, situation or interaction as self-concepts develop and change over time. As knowledge, skills and competencies develop, rather than occupy a position they come perceive as constraining or imposed, individuals can take up a reflexive tactical stance, based on their own unique set of skills, competencies and experiences—learned through exposure and friction that emerge from movement in time-space.

I argued, these tactical backpackers, ‘work’ the system (Goffman, 1961) using embodied (sub)cultural capital to search for a more authentic, truer self and sees them partly reject or distance themselves from the social world in which their habitus evolved, involving a change in perception of their role, a change they hope to perform, impress and communicate (bodily and verbally) upon others. Mobility, I argue is the necessary perquisite one if one is to develop the capacity to be reflexive about the scapes, the internal gaze allowing for growth, while the external gaze reasserts boundaries of self (Aitken and Lukinbeal, 1997). This stance becomes very visible when a more reflexive backpacker feels a lack of fit between the habitus (feel for the game) and field (the game itself), without it actually constituting a break from the game or the role. A tactical stance is an ongoing script and comes about after much travel experience and reflexivity, their embodied capital manifesting itself as (economic, cultural, social) skills, abilities, knowledge, and competencies which are put to use in the scapes in which they are embedded. This capital helps them to maneuver with naturalness and ease within the scapes and its implicitly agreed logic of what it takes to be a real traveller. Those who develop a tactical stance can demonstrate it by undertaking shortcuts and roundabout paths—so as to define and individualise their presence within the scapes, performing it to the point where it flows seamlessly from them, bodily and linguistically without any apparent effort or forethought. It is a performance that must not appear to be performance, but does not precede but follows from practice, as individuals over time-space realise the reality they live in is their own construction and it can be changed by the way they engage with it, by how they use their bodies, through their sense of time or upping the ante. They feel far more secure in their (sub)cultural capital and in their authority as tastemakers and story tellers, using their competences to overcome the obstacles shared by their strategic competitors, reaffirmed by their ability or at least perception that they are finding cheaper accommodation, more real experiences, everything for which the ‘strategic’ has to pay full ‘guidebook’ price. While strategic backpackers are more inclined to stay in the centre of the scapes as they move.
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about in unknown territories, tactical backpackers constantly re-position themselves in their orbit, taking up opportunities without loosing their bearings.

While they may appear more nomadic as they resist mapping and labeling, they remain anchored in the scapes, seeking clarity about self through encounters with the Other, even if such clarity is ‘temporal, superficial, shallow, and vague’ (Kim, 2003: 29). Rather than consume a string of pre-defined attractions and structured experiences, they reshape their perceptions and appreciations to confront constraints and grasp opportunities, requiring a high degree of awareness in relation to others as they self-reflexivity strive for authenticity, their competence, skill and knowledge enabling them to take a slightly different route, find another beach, a local restaurant, navigate a market or find a cheaper room. I argue they are not better backpackers, simply because of their more reflexive way of seeing, or because they seek to create their own trajectories or pathways if given such affordances. However, I argued their tactical interventions shape or contest the scapes boundaries. I argue that interplay (conflict and collaboration) is central to backpacking, since the habitus must be shared, or at least be understood and accepted by all the other actors in the game (Leach, 2005), and while the more tactical traveller will feign the position of the resistant, independent, autonomous, down-to-earth ‘traveller’ who can seek recourse in ambivalence, self-organisation, self-reliance and uncertainty, their victories must be ultimately communicated, feeding back into the scapes through myths, gossip and stories allowing for the continual reproduction and rejuvenation of the scapes. All backpackers, I argued must continually test their victories and knowledge so as to gain recognition, Shotter (1993: 31) noting how that people will only have a sense of ‘belonging’ if the others around them are prepared to ‘respond to ‘reality’, only if others around them are prepared to respond to what they do and say seriously’.

I argue, the concept of a backpacker habitus is a major contribution to knowledge, but rather than used to extrapolate a ‘pure’ backpacker style or typology of backpackers, I found neither the strategic or tactical backpacker is a pure position, neither one more ‘authentic’ or ‘traditional’ than the other as they compete, negotiate and collaborate for the same limited capital, their polemic struggle for distinction carried out against shifting valuations. Indeed, I argue those who have lived different lives and speak a different language might ultimately occupy a different position, and develop their own habitus. The Israeli backpacker habitus for example is felt and performed slightly differently, their habitus generating different practices and social spaces. By understanding backpacking as created
and recreated through a ‘durable’ but not ‘eternal’ set of individual and collective dispositions that fits within the confines of the scapes, producing practices in relation to a supportive field is a radical change in our understanding of the phenomenon and offers a theoretical framework within which to explain the orientation to action of a geographically dispersed population. These dispositions and acquired schemes of thought, perception, appreciation and action (a way of being, seeing, acting and living) become embodied in the individual as an ongoing process, that is conscious and beyond conscious, their self belief in the backpacker role and its potential for transformative and renewal creating an world in which they feel a natural part, and therefore demonstrate (bodily and mentally) a sense of spatial, temporal and social belonging by searching and accumulating (sub)cultural capital.

9.4 The Traveller(scapes).

I have argued for the concept of ‘travellerscapes’ (scapes), the landscapes of mobility and practice that have come to represent this imagined world (community), scapes that are mental, symbolic, imaginary, material and lived, inscribed with and reflecting ‘social orders and specific cultural values and meanings’ (Allon, 2004: 52). I argued the counterculture caused a fundamental disjuncture, where a countercultural imagination enabled new imagined worlds. I described one such world that emerged through a countercultural way of seeing, being and doing in the 1960’s, where a journey east constructed a world with its own rituals and logic, the resulting mobility of ideas, bodies, images and narratives creating a new cultural context, a landscape that as a ‘collective imagination’ was claimed by tens of thousands. These landscapes allowed for geographically dispersed individuals who committed to its ‘countercultural’ logic to accumulate knowledge and distinction in a non-quotidian reality and as a ‘field’, acquired autonomy from the entirety of the social field, possessing its own history, habitus and a distinctive set of beliefs. I argued that these landscapes imaginatively and physically anchor individuals in a terrain they hope to know, where individuals allow that world to envelop them as they position it around themselves, their collective illusio (as doxa) at the core of backpacker culture by the way in which the performing backpackers come together as the collective body in space. While these backpackers do not belong to the people, cultures and places they traverse, their embodied engagement with the world (lived and performed) becomes a terrain, through which the formation of the self and one’s place in the world can becomes clearer, these landscapes of mobility representing and producing a lived environment, the scapes recognisable by individuals seduced by what they offer even if such attributes are as much real as
Build around a matrix of routes, products, institutions, materialities, systems, services, people, objects, sensations, places and sites; spatially and temporally distributed but ‘ready to hand by those who inhabit time and space to accumulate its socially produced values, I argued the scapes are made ‘performable’ by subjects who hope to be seen as competent actors. They are shaped, performed and reproduced into being, a world whose critics would argue weakens the connection ‘between everyday lived culture and territorial location’ (Tomlinson, 1999: 128) since identity is not rooted in a particular geographic location but in mobility. It is a world premised on individuals continuing to aspire and assume the social and cultural codes embedded in these landscapes of mobility and practice, where identity claims are made through inter-subjectively movement with others over its uneven terrains in ‘such a way that knowledge is built up along lines of movement’ (Ingold, 2004: 331). The relationship between capital and subjectivity is crucial in how a set of dispositions are integrated in broad affinity with others in a sense of ‘symbiotic path dependency – trajectories that intertwine and share a common direction’ (Adey, 2009: 23) based on the fundamental truths of the field (doxa). Intersubjective movement is done in relation to the self and with/ for others, ‘performed’ ‘for others and the self – including self-regulation and negotiation inter-subjectively’ (Crouch, 2004: 88). Rather than simply inhabiting fleeting internal landscapes, I argue that the scapes help construct a habitus, which is individually and collectively attained and validated by others inhabiting these same scapes, acting as a medium of exchange through which subjects are constituted, embodied and emplaced in a world which they hope to meaningfully know.

These scapes then are a temporal, spatial and social reality that offers a belonging, imaginative expansion, transformation and a sense of place. Rather than a smooth nomadic space, it is suffused with unpredictability and friction, a horizon of possibility sitting alongside national and local spaces (as well as economic and political power). I argued this world has history, and described in detail how this world emerged before solidifying into material infrastructure, from appropriated buildings, products, and transport to guidebooks. I described how the politics of mobility led to this world and all those who positioned themselves in it to become vilified, the African-American Institute (1974), for example noting how in 1972 Kenya closed its frontiers to ‘hippies’ and forbade nude bathing. I argued that it wasn’t until the scapes were retrenched through a combination of touristic, educational and economic discourses, that the newly relabeled backpackers were
accepted as its new inhabitants and were soon augmented by guidebooks. Augmenting mobility and institutionalising word of mouth, they made visible the underlying structures of the social world, representing an imagined world as if it were simply given and inevitable (Bold, 1999). High status actors like the Lonely Planet soon appropriated symbolic power to make and appropriate meanings about what to see, where to stay and go, leaving others ‘unmarked’ and ‘unendorsed’ (MacCannell, 1976), their ability to hold and use the ‘symbolic capital’ (Bourdieu, 1989) creating economic profit.

However, the imprecise and continually shifting sites of struggle demands appropriation and manipulated by backpackers themselves so as to make their world explicable and the game worthwhile. Navigating socially, the use of the internet, guidebooks and places of identification such as backpacker hostels, cafes, transport and enclaves are used to make sense of this fragmented world; interaction and encounter with other backpackers remaining a fundamental part of backpacking and the socialisation process, providing a sense of place and belonging as subjects slowly gain the competencies, knowledge and skills to read, see and consume this world of imprecise free floating landmarks, sensations, connections, socialites, encounters, events, sights and sites. Those new to the scapes will seek to demonstrate that their activities are aligned with field-imposed views, as they slowly become semioticians, reading the scapes inter-subjectively with others, their imagination enacted corporeally and physically as individuals travel from place to place, deriving meaning and accumulating capital from particular routes, systems, places and events that reinforces a certain view of their social world. Once socialised, backpackers will continually represent these scapes to themselves and others (through blogs, emails, performance), the journey becoming ‘a spatial and temporal frame to be filled with identity narratives’ (Elsrud, 2001: 605), each place becoming a pause to someplace else which can be referenced and compared to others.

I argued that from the point of view of any particular individual backpacker, the scapes look like more-or-less stable, their mobility becoming a kind of dwelling, continual movement between places creating a sense of place, coping with geographic space by associating practice and place. I argued that the scapes are made performable by networks of mobility (NOM) which structure these scapes, routes that are lived, temporal, active and social, constituting distance and places to be crossed, practiced and performed in situ, where a heterogeneous assemblage of backpackers, travel agencies, tour operators, media, entrepreneurs, vendors, governments officials, NGO’s, volunteer organisations, internet
cafes, guidebooks, mobile phones, churches, phone shops, taxi drivers, accommodation owners, touts, transport networks, prostitutes, hostels and events overlap. I noted the increased coherence of some routes where multinational businesses have made commercial inroads, variable capital and capitalism circulating and operating more openly, the routes taking on many of the characteristics of an ordered travelling culture in a ‘managed playground’ (Bauman, 1993b). The tourism industry and other fields of power and production were not initially involved or influential in drifter travel, seeing little value or prestige in it, given drifters overt visual and embodied performance of alienation (Sobocinska, 2008), their ragged clothes, cheap and barely habitable accommodations, long hair and disposition towards thrift and asceticism meaning they found little economic value in them. However, I argue such commercial inroads are natural, the scapes always thoroughly imbued with entrepreneurial profit making\(^{165}\) (cf. Frank, 1997). Since its rebirth, the nascent backpacker industry has matured quickly, spawning ‘a series of industry associations linking hostels and backpacker service providers’ (UNWTO, 2008), the ‘backpacking concept’ attracting and supporting a host of different services from specialist travel agents, insurance companies, budget accommodation franchises, Gap year companies, guidebook publishers, while at the centre of these scapes are hop-off buses, travel agents, vendors, Internet cafes, hostels, english speaking guides and infrastructures than unobtrusively contain, channel, focus and aid movement. These systems and spaces, I argue are not an issue if they simply aid movement but increasingly these mediating actors are producing stages by mediating ‘doings’, leaving some individual freedoms intact but pushing backpackers towards being pure receivers, their practices ‘in thrall to both knowledge and power’, leaving only the ‘narrowest leeway to representational spaces’ (Lefebvre, 1991a: 50; original emphasis). There is no doubting the global reach and power of capitalism, and while uneven, the ordering of time and space relies on abstraction of place is in accordance with the logic of capital accumulation (Harvey, 2001) with entrepreneurs to multinationals seeking to impose ‘the definition of the social world that is best suited to their interests’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 167), their motivation more economic rather than altruistic, their policies and staging’s typically elaborated through a spatial system of inclusions and exclusions. These actors don’t seek to control backpackers nor the scapes, but shape the social space in which they dwell and inhabit, fostering habits of consumption that includes their product or service.

\(^{165}\) Peck (1985: 163) coined the phrase ‘from counterculture to over-the-counter culture’.
If one were to stop here, one would agree with Welk (2004: 40) who argues today’s overland scene highlights backpacking as a ‘conformist mass phenomenon’, drawn if not pushed from sensation to sensation by their desires and impulses within ‘stylized landscapes that are strategically planned and designed with market imperatives as the key design goal’ (Cooper and Hall, 2008: 115), backpackers grazing on the ‘ration of simulacra the system distributes to each individual’ (de Certeau, 1988: 166). De Certeau (1988: 165) notes that instead of increasing ‘nomadism’ defined by ‘self-mobility’ there is a reduction, with increased confinement, as the scapes are sold in reductive form. For critics, backpacking is as institutionalised and consumption led as other forms of tourism, the commodification of the scapes overdetermined by the many formal businesses, informal vendors, inside experts and ‘expressive’ and industry professionals who are ‘plugged in’ (van der Duim, 2007a: 157); a vast infrastructure offering the myth of autonomy, the centre of the scapes turned into a systems of circulation and consumption, where capital flows and multinationals have set up, transforming routes, enclaves and social spaces into commodities, laid out for potential visitors (Noy and Cohen, 2005; Shaw and Williams, 2004; Urry, 2007). However, the process of socialisation however is far too fluid, the scapes far too uneven, as gossip, myths, images, information, technologies, objects, stories and advice continually rescale and reorganise the scapes, the interplay between backpackers and other actors highlighting how ‘[p]laces then have no objective reality, only intersubjective ones’ (Shurmer-Smith and Hannam, 1994: 13). While backpackers initially accept the world as it is, a continual intuitive and radical inter-subjectivity helps to continually construct this social world in unpredictable and contingent ways, the habitus ultimately providing individuals with the necessary skills, confidence and knowledge to traverse and contest these fluid, contested and ever-changing landscapes. While prone to ‘invasion’ by those who seek a measure of control over (sub)cultural capital and spaces of representation, they cannot redefine ‘the legitimate principles of the field’ (Bourdieu, 1991: 242). However, as economic interests who invest in this world grow in power, I agree with Crossley (2004) noting that once external factors intervene in a field, they might compromise the criteria, often unintentionally, which shapes and motivates activity, jeopardising its rationality and its worth as a game.

I argued that the interplay that enlivens the scapes may not be fast enough, or wide-ranging enough for many in the tourism industry, the traditional means of invigoration too slow for capitalist accumulation, a world where individuals will do their best given their dispositions and limited resources. This can be seen as too aimless and unstructured for
cultural brokers who can ‘flatten’ the scapes, exploiting discursive constructions to channel mobility into acceptable pathways, ideal types and stagings, so as to locate them in particular spaces and within particular boundaries. While no one intermediary is fully in control of the uneven scapes, overlapping fields of production and power might threaten, narrow, flatten, map and make safe / visible the scapes by creating sub-fields in which ‘symbolic goods [are] produced to respond to external demand’ (Champagne, 1995/2005: 55), enabling more manageable positions that allow individuals to employ their middle-class ‘habitus’. The extension of the label into more structured and more productive overland tours, volunteers, working holiday makers, gappers, grey nomads, and the more personalised and elite subjectivities of flashpackers mean the scapes have become home to many positions.

Those who enter the imagined world (community) via these positions are often unable or unwilling to internalise the backpacker role as a ‘primary identity’, which lies elsewhere, framed by other positions which demand active corporeal, temporal and social involvement, allowing ‘some social actors to slip in and out of different contexts, identities, and relationships’ (Sheller, 2004: 49). For these participants, the scapes offer a means to be ‘in’ but not ‘of’ the contexts in which they are located, aesthetic values making the scapes attractive, at least momentarily as individuals move from identity to identity (volunteer, eco-tourist, teacher, environmentalist, conservationist, backpacker, student, working holiday maker), sufficient form related convergence enabling them to continually ‘experience something new’ (O’ Dell, 2005: 12), rather than encountering and negotiating the scapes on a learning trajectory. The interactions between participants in these positions and backpackers are often superficial, perfunctory, transient and short-lived, since they don’t share the same illusio, unwilling to submit to the scapes doxa and make the same investments in the game. For Bauman (2005: 1), the liquid modern society, is one where ‘its members act change faster than it takes the ways of acting to consolidate into habits and routines’, but, I argue that it is only through belief and interaction amongst people ‘who are share the same cultural worldview that the social world is continually reproduced (or sometimes transformed) and reinforced in people’s consciousness’ (Johnston, 2008: 157).

These positions are increasingly ‘representing’ backpacking in the public consciousness, the status and (sub)cultural capital of ‘traditionally’ positioned backpackers de-valued outside the scapes, rendering their position less socially valued and the scapes less autonomous. As participants with increased mobility choices value the institutionalised
cultural capital embedded in more structured positions, capital that can often guarantee convertibility, if not from your peers, then your employer, university admissions officer and family, backpacking’s decline may be hastened by a middle class who seek to ‘invest in the acquisition of legitimate competences’ (Bourdieu, 1984: 509). Preferred roles like the WHM or gapper have been given official rights and official naming, ascribing their bodies with particular mobility rights and capital, which can be legally, socially or economically guaranteed. These positions are often glorified and legitimised as been better for communities, for the environment, for personal character and for future careers, opening up the scapes for larger numbers, potentially changing how the game is played. While no power has the capacity to impose the legitimate definition of backpacking, institutional specialists such as gap year organisations, governments, universities, parents and employers can subject the scapes to systematic discursive interpretation that allows them to sell the scapes as a commodity. While identifying with backpacking, they remain in the spaces and settings at the centre of the scapes, given their desire for convenience, speed, playfulness, sociality, health and safety, but choosing not to see ‘how the environments we shape can, in turn, work to reshape us’ (Meyrowitz, 1985: 329), the centre carrying ‘the person as if in a stream, and one needs hardly to swim for oneself’ (Simmel, 1997: 184).

I argued that the centre of the scapes, it’s a complex assemblage of sites, products, services, vendors, infrastructure and systems, where individuals can be guided towards signs and markers with Edensor (2000: 127) noting how ‘the imperative for smooth transit between attractions is facilitated by the rigorous maintenance of networks and tourist spaces to maximise the quest for commodities and experiences’ the ‘violence of speed’, increasingly capable of moving people at greater speeds along uniform, leveled out routes (Schivelbusch, 1986). As the scapes shrink or expand depending on the speed at which they are traversed by individuals and groups, the shared sense of place and rhythm may unravel, as will the socialisation process. Holmes (2001) argues, it is a paradox that geographic forms of association, integration and solidarity are both weakened and strengthened by technological and communicational extension. Whether it is the gap year or volunteer, these positions may not necessarily signify a powerful position within the scapes vis-a-vis others backpackers, but their ‘spatial autonomy’ is reinforced by fields of production and power, given their economic capital is socially and politically valued, the UNWTO (2008), for example, noting how flashpackers are now the driving growth in youth
tourism (hostels166 worldwide are upgrading their bunk-bed dormitories to meet their requirements for private rooms, ensuite, air conditioning and Wi-Fi). Their mobility because it is actively supported can actively weaken the mobility of backpackers, differential mobility undermining the power of others (Massey, 1993), their positions potentially altering the rules of the game). I did not argue that these ‘positions’ lack a ‘sense of place’167, or identification and neither is this an argument to warn against a ‘lost art of travel’, a diatribe against speed, technology or commercialisation or against individuals who consciously and unconsciously do not expose themselves to interactions, encounters and symmetrical interaction through which backpackers have traditionally found a sense of place and each other. It is simply recognition that many ‘backpackers’ are shielded from messy mobilities and ambiguities and are often unwilling to put their mind and bodies ‘on the line’ for (sub)cultural capital (their access to such capital may often be limited).

I argued that for some individuals, the scapes come to be seen as over-stretched, overused, over-determined and ‘like roads, ‘a mere function of motion’ (Sennett, 1994), where self-interest demands a sense of place and dwelling in movement, where the habitus develops a momentum that can generate practices some time after the original conditions which shaped it have vanished, their dispositions to believe keeping a particular identity narrative going (Giddens, 1991), enabling us to talk about backpacking not simply in spatial terms since ‘their projects and behaviours … surpass spatial mobility alone’ (Kaufmann, 2002: 44). I argue those with a tactical stance see the journey as a game that is continuously worked on and like a flâneur, it means ‘to play the game of playing’ (Bauman, 1993: 172). I argued that the uneven scapes ‘charged with narrative potential’ (Morris, 1998a: 34) for those individuals who have the competencies, skills and knowledge to grasp opportunities and its excesses, the ‘existence of a field presupposes and, in its functioning, creates a belief on the part of participants in the legitimacy and value of the capital which is at stake in the field’ (Jenkins, 2003: 85). For those struggling to stay ahead in the game, it is ‘a world endowed with sense and value, in which it is worth investing one’s energy’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 127), as they use time to feel localised, despaced and retbralised, ‘facilitating a neo-primordial world in which participation and interaction were maximized’ (Rycroft, 2003: 93).

---

166 Hecht and Martin (2006: 70) believe the ‘older, more affluent contemporary backpacker may ensure both growth and revitalization for those hostels willing to accommodate the changing needs of this new class of customers’.

167 Harvey (1989) argues that it is only when time and space are blurred to the point that we can no longer mark or record our experiences, losing our capacity to develop our sense of place.
I argued these tactics are not (and nor do they have to be) as radical and all encompassing as the ones that caused the disjuncture that led to the emergence of the scapes, with all backpackers legitimising their position against what they consider the scapes legitimate principles, these partial revolutions (Bourdieu, 1991) slowly but continually rejuvenating the scapes while sustaining the relative autonomy of the field. While unintentional, these revolts and victories can cause profoundly unpredictable relationships among ethnoscapes, technoscapes and financescapes, each subject to its ‘own constraints and incentives’ (Appadurai, 1996: 35) as histories, agents, origins and trajectories are ‘coming from different angles and moving at different rhythms’ (Marginson and Sawir, 2005: 303). I argued that there has been a proliferation of sub-fields of restricted production as ‘backpacking’ as a whole grows larger and more complex, technologies of the self such as Couchsurfing.com (CS) providing instrument of ‘rupture’ (Bourdieu, 1991), that allow for partial revolutions, helping its participants to transform themselves by changing the nature of the game by bringing fresh layers of meaning and significance to the scapes as well as ‘networks of cooperation, sharing of knowledge and solidarity’ (Kesselring, 2008: 79). The sites, I argue offer its participants the hope of recovering the world of differences, offering a ‘return’ of more natural, self-powered physical encounters and the dispositions and style of the ‘great American archetypes, the hobo, the bum, the hitch hiker on the ‘open road’’ (Hall, 1968).

CS provides its users an opportunity to take control of their self-image, as they set out to ‘win space’ by being with others, who are felt to be more personalised, authentic and identity enhancing, casting off much of the power they believe the tourism industry has to commodity aspects of their lives. By entering into a pragmatic discursive pact with others, they hope to produce themselves as ‘proper subjects’; their dispositions often deeply embedded in their subjective consciousness, anchoring a basic worldview about the way they should lead their lives that I argue also operates long after their return home. As much as many tactical travellers feel they have stopped playing roles, and are ‘now behaving ‘naturally’ and ‘being’ themselves’ (Meyrowitz, 1985), mobility can be brought home in the form of motility (mobility potentials), a form of convertible capital through which individuals can readjust their social and spatial practices, enabling them to continue to dwell in particular mobilities, not only virtually, psychologically, emotionally, imaginatively and symbolically but also socially and physically.

This I argue is a major departure from traditional readings of backpacking and a major
contribution to knowledge. While most backpackers will return to former lives, embodied dispositions accumulated as (embodied) capital are ‘converted into an integral part of the person’ (Bourdieu, 1997: 47), dispositions that are at a felt level, independent of an ever changing and fractured world, sites like CS emerging to offer a continuity that ‘is only a product of the person's reflexive beliefs about their own biography’ (Giddens 1991: 53). The site enables them to keep a ‘keep a particular narrative going’ (ibid, 53), enabling them to transpose and invoke these dispositions into a ‘coherent’ self-narrative that integrates all past experiences, making permanent something that could only be previously ephemeral. I argue that participation in sites like CS becomes a creative and meaningful act, demonstrating how routes in combination with roots have become a defining feature of modern life, identity-making and global belonging not merely reflecting what happens at ‘self-styled tourist sites and encounters involving tourists away from home’ (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 6), but existing in one’s ‘own immediate lives and circles’ (Franklin, 2003a: 11). I argued that its members are driven by felt dispositions that sees the site as an extension of their natural self, ‘home’ a space’ where individuals can re-establish some kind of territoriality, reactivating dispositions to realise elements of their biography and transformation that remained unfulfilled in the ‘standardized, homogenized, and congested physical space of mass society’ (Andrejevic, 2003: 134). These ‘embodied’ dispositions have a irreversible quality making it ‘difficult to revert to the old paths’ (Giddens, 1991: 114), the greater control over subjectivity stimulating socialities, thick co-presence, intimacy, meetingness and reciprocity in everyday life, where the ‘de-routinization’ of temporalities and spatialities alter, challenge and blur the ‘long-established and traditionally-significant boundaries between distinct spheres’ (Livingstone, 2005: 163). This narrative, Giddens argues cannot be wholly fictive, but must ‘continually integrate events which occur in the external world, and sort them into the ongoing ‘story’ about the self’ (Giddens 1991: 53) which makes sense, providing a sense of purpose, significance and personal fulfillment.

9.5 The Future of Backpacking and Contribution to Knowledge.

Alex Garland, writer of the emblematic backpacker opus, The Beach attributed the book and film adaptations success not only to the narrative, but to the subject matter in which backpackers were protagonists, which he felt, appealed to a ‘silent demographic’ under represented in contemporary literature (Redden and Macdonald, 2002), an imagined world (community) that has a continual resonance to the tens of thousands of individuals who
seek to engage in a form of cultural production, their desire for mobility mobilising the imagination and desire, with those with the relevant access and belief converting that desire into action. Kaufmann (2002: 21) argues that ‘all mobility has repercussions on identity, and inversely, that an identity is built on mobility’ and where individual and collective belief is build on adhering to the logic of a game, it will impact on how the world is ‘seen’ and ‘lived’. I argued throughout this dissertation that there is a practical logic to this world, if one looks, listens and participates, the orderliness and interdependence of people’s actions and relationships ‘not produced by an external structure that exists independently of the actions of its participants’ (Johnston, 2008: 148), but a world that is inter-subjectively real as individuals move with others through the possibilities and constraints that the scapes provide, a world I argue provides the means for a new subjectivity to emerge. Using a bricolage strategy, I sought a new way of seeing, to ‘uncover new insights into research and knowledge production, new forms of reason that are directly connected to specific contexts, practical forms of analysis that are informed by social theory, and the concreteness of lived situations’ (Kincheloe, 2005: 345), to produce concepts and insights about the social world that previously did not exist, transcending the words of interviewees, their actions, movement, practices, beliefs and values to produce knowledge about a world in greater detail.

Through the bricolage, I sought to describe their world, a world of movement and flux, an imagined world (community) that offers both opportunities and constraints to those privileged enough to position them selves within it. I have sought to contribute to our knowledge about ‘world travelling’ (Lugones, 1987), its mobilities and immobilities, a world where movement opens up more door than it closes, unlike worlds of migrants and refugees, where the movement of the dispossessed might be limited to refugee camps, detention centres, brothels and other limited locations, where subjectivities are marginalised, exploited and subordinated. The (traveller)scapes, I explored is a world for the privileged, and often ignored, its touristic like consumptions and the stories and images that emerge often treated as less worthy of study. In comparison to those sometimes forced to move to ‘worlds’ (Lugones, 2003: 17) such as sexscapes (Brennan, 2004), these individuals are powerful players in the age of mobility, a ‘rooted’ cosmopolitan identity with ‘roots and wings’ (Beck, 2008), and a harbinger of worlds emerging at various scales. It may as barriers to mobility fall, such worlds may become more common, and for the tens of thousands who enter this world, it might offer and fulfill a learning rather than a planned trajectory, providing opportunities for a ‘possible self’ to inhabit a life with purpose and
direction, even if temporally (Parish, 2008). It is not about being from somewhere, but instead being somewhere, and in the process of going somewhere; a narrative forming around the concept of travel and mobility, ‘[f]ree time .... naturally transforms anyone who enjoys it into a different person’ (Marx, in Duncan, 1973: 185).

Like any label (beatnik, vagabond, wanderer, hippie, drifter), I argued that individuals have little control over what the journalistic, political and economic powers decide to make of this world and the backpacker label. As subjectivity becomes categorised in an explicit state, there is a risk of the label been exhausted and emptied of meaning. The gapper is now durably embedded in middle class dispositions, the tourism industry and other actors flattening the scapes, or representing them as such, so as to respond effectively to affluent and rational consumers, their modifying practices ultimately risking a mismatch between the transformation potential expected from the role and the practical mastery that can be acquired in the field. However, backpacking is inter-subjectively real, largely existing in the interplay of skilled accomplishments as competent participants, always hoping for a performance that conveys ‘the impression that his conception of himself and of them is the same as their conception of themselves and him’ (Goffman, 1951: 294). Rather than a ‘backpacking superhighway paved with cheap lodgings, English- or even Hebrew speaking natives, and restaurants serving banana pancakes’ (Haviv, 2005: 82), those with the skill and competence will ultimately seek to craft their own meaning and emotional responses using mobile tactics, tools and mediums to push on through ‘friction’, ‘uncertainty’, ‘autonomy’, ‘ambivalence’ so as to accumulate capital, the habitus enabling an infinite number of ‘moves’ to be made, that ultimately no borders or rules can contain. I argue that researchers need to look at touristic worlds again, not simply at singular practices such as sightseeing or destinations and attractions, but all its linkages, nodes and connections, and especially those who position themselves within them.

My approach to this world enabled me to map out this wold and those within it, and while this investigation is partial without end, because this world is always on the move and being remade, my contribution I believe has been substantial. I argued for a continuum between strategic and tactical travellers, between whose acting / acted upon strategically and those at ease in the scapes, fluent speakers in this ‘world’ who seek to test its boundaries, forgoing the mediums which were once extensions of their bodies in time space (backpacks, vaccinations, guidebooks, hostels, backpacker transport), grasping opportunities based on the ‘rules of the game’ or ‘how the game is played’ so as to sustain
their sense of a coherent self. I followed backpacker movements, practices and representations to ‘external triggers’ (Wacquant, 2006) like CS, which is assisting individuals to become self-directed, self-managed in the face of others who bear witness. The increasing convergence between travel and the Internet is reconfiguring corporeal travel practices, backpackers travelling ‘on’ the Internet, ‘part of the de-differentiation of tourism and everyday life’ (Jansson, 2007: 7). CS, I argued enables hosts (locals) to emerge, embodying the imagined position of the exotic Other, but one through which they can exercise agency, the exchange value more equal as members challenge the sedentary stability of ‘proper’ accommodation, demonstrating a subjectivity they want acknowledged and affirmed. As people come into contact and inhabit various networks, rather than a dangerous globalising discourse which might tag and trap locals as ‘color’, mobility might instead advocate a more ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ (Appiah, 2005), since there is ‘no cosmopolitanism without localism’ (Beck, 2002: 19). I argued individuals, given the intensity arising from backpacking (and other forms of mobility) can construct a social and symbolic space of lifestyle that cuts across public-private, social-personal dualisms, a structured mobility that anchors the individual to its ‘imaginary depths’ (Grossberg, 1992), like-minded selves brought together through shared dispositions that connect previous travel experiences and future actions, sustaining a coherent and consistent narrative of the self, that helps explain themselves to themselves (Giddens, 1991). These technologies of the self require a high level of involvement and participation, re-tribalising much of what its users believe are the mass massification of guidebooks, hostels and the extension of the label has broken. I argue, in a major contribution to knowledge that backpackers are helping themselves, utilising opportunities to become self-organised and managed, critical practices allowing the Other to join in discursive agreement, giving them a position in this complex socio-spatial game.

Using Bourdieu’s theory of a practice as a heuristic device and extending it has proved very useful ‘just because to do so forces one to think’ (Nash, 1999: 185), his theory of practice alerting us ‘to new possibilities, new assemblies, new ways of seeing relationships’ (Bernstein, 1996: 136). It set backpacking in context, its players and institutions, while at the same time grasping the internal structure, its multi-post disciplinary nature gelling with my bricolage strategy. Dealing with backpacking in a unifying way allowed me to incorporate findings from fieldwork data and literature from other fields, allowing me to create something new, incorporating aspects of this world usually analysed separately. Through his three concepts of habitus, field and capital, it contributes new knowledge about
backpacking. While on the surface, it is a simple model, it enables us to see subjective experience and agency as ‘consciously felt’. Rather than seeing backpacking as an ‘alternative’ to tourism or producing passive cultural dupes, Bourdieu helps illustrate the illusio of ‘real travel’, the normative regulating principles, fundamental truths and fantasy of the scapes that compels each backpacker to struggle and compete for the same stakes, gelling long enough to exchange, gift, share and communicate, leading to ideas, agreements, and disagreements, the brief and fleeting victories when new space is ‘won’ and ‘authenticity’ exists before been passed on through interplay. The autonomy of the field is retained in this intricate interplay, fleeting victories unearthed as the more competent, skilled and knowledgeable backpacker turns ‘from that which is familiar to them and seek out, again and again, something which is not yet contaminated …not by moving up or down but by moving out’ (Goffmann, 1951: 304). It enabled me to develop and argue for, the concept of (sub)cultural capital, capital when accumulated in its embodied form, makes us rethink the whole concept of backpacking, the set of dispositions that mobility helps yield, turning much about what we think about backpacking on its head, forcing to us to relook at the dualisms (home-away, absence-presence, consumer-producer, host-guest, public-private) we associate with backpacking and tourism. My bricolage, in producing new knowledge, can help to inform, potentially helping to guide prospective practitioners, policy makers and management in future actions.

9.5.1 Implications for further research.

In the ‘highly globalised/mobilized world we inhabit today’ (Cresswell and Uteng, 2008a: 1), I believe tourism researchers will need to look again at touristic mobilities, and the practices tied to being ‘on the move’. Mobilities and their relations to tourism are still understudied and undertheorised, and where innovations in communication and transport has resulted in a circumstance in which we have all come to see ourselves, albeit in many different ways, as existing in some relation to the global, touristic mobilities should become central to the analysis of social relations in contemporary society. I argue that for many individuals living in globalised and post-modern times, nothing is stable, routes taking predominance over roots as individuals seek or are forced to live in a ‘deterritorialised’ world where everything is flowing and moving. Backpackers, whose acquisition of such mobility is often analogous to a struggle for acquiring new subjectivity, who travel in part ‘to be with’ others in the present, in moments of intense co-present fellow feeling’ (Urry, 2002: 261) must now be viewed in regard other mobilities. Such an understanding requires researchers to engage in
an ontological discussion regarding the similarities and differences between various mobilities (i.e. their worldviews).

In addition, a more substantial conceptual reflection needs to be made with regard to the mutual constitution of mobility and society. While much touristic mobility is related to cultural norms and a developed tourist culture, creating a bridge to practices such as sightseeing and other shared ways of doing, creating ‘a sub-set of behavioural patterns and values that tend to emerge only when the visitors are travelling’ (Williams, 1998: 157), this text argued that individuals can belong to multiple worlds, with varying obligations, skills, knowledge, competencies, techniques and know-how to be learned in order to negotiate belonging. It is the failure of the scholastic imagination to adapt to a world on the move, the ways in which collective imaginations become possible through diverse mediums from cinema, narratives produced via informal networks, literary and textual imaginations to the official discourse of the state (often inscribed through monuments, historical figures and structures). Each world requires mastery of particular forms and styles of expression, including validated performances of mobility. From movement in daily life such as commuting to migration and Diaspora, the global arena is now home to distinct mobile cultures and practices, ‘mobilities increasingly developing ‘into a distinct field with characteristic struggles, taste and habituses’ (Urry, 2007: 196). To date, very little research has examined the lives those who undertake temporary mobility, even though their lives are equally constituted through the journeys they make and identities that were once upon a time locally rooted have now become multiple and changing over a lifetime. Researchers must recognise how fluid and unbounded social formations containing geographically dispersed individuals can attain coherence and the capacity to relate, adapt and learn from the environment around them, even if such research requires crossing theoretical borders to capitalise on progress made in other disciplines and fields of study. As much as backpackers lives are constituted through the journey, constituting subjectivity in progress and a way of being in the world, other (and often alternative) ways of moving, communicating and dwelling need to be investigated (dumpster diving, hitchhiking, hospitality exchange), individual agency engendering a larger temporal and spatial field of relationships and movements.

Finally, this dissertation does have a methodological contribution; the multiparadigmatic and bricoleur approach advantageous for the research of tourism phenomena and mobile groups and cultures, a methodology that reflected the way backpackers move, dwell and
communicate, reflecting the way I moved, dwelled and communicated during my field research. Primarily this involved a methodological bricolage capable of forging a combination of multiple methods to create something new, however partial.

9.5.2 Recommendations for future research.

Further research should be carried out on whether the accumulation of (sub)cultural capital over a long period is detrimental to an individuals social / cultural / economic capital and whether an opportunity cost exists. Does a reshuffling a backpackers value system mean individuals might for a time experience downward mobility, their accumulation of (sub)cultural capital detrimental to their position in the worlds they return to (if such capital cannot be converted into social distinction). In societies, where success and social mobility are highly valued and promoted, there is no doubt (sub)cultural might be stigmatising since capital ‘must be read as acceptable by the receiving society before any social prestige can accrue’ (Ong, 1999: 92). However, such a choice, rather than leading to a loss of confidence and social disorientation might also lead to a satisfying alternative life trajectory, newly embedded dispositions a counterpoint to their parents social position. Another area of investigation is the impact upon the sense of place and the meaning of displacement if backpackers continue to be ‘attached’ to the social network and routines of their home. While backpackers imagine themselves as participating in a plurality of worlds, which are multiple, simultaneous, and perspectival, the omnipresence of information and communication technologies might mean a changed relationship with the left-behind worlds of those who have moved or are on the move. Since worlds must be practiced in order to exist at all, staying ‘attached’ to friends, family and work can blur the experience of individuals across places, spaces, and times as they connect their participation (and often obligations) in one world with another, creating potential conflict if participants struggle to communicate their belonging to new worlds to those they leave behind. However, as I have noted, once they return home, imagined worlds (communities) overlap, these same technologies enabling backpackers to remain sensitive to the worlds they once participated in. In both cases, a careful balance be maintained.

More research also needs to take into mechanisms of exclusion within the scapes and the marked inequalities of mobility for different groups (females, disabled, LGBT, locals, older travellers) as well as geographies of fear. White middle class westerners can be seen as inscribing the dominant ideology and defining the ‘normal’ in the scapes, for some; there
are obstacles to participating in this world, feelings of being ‘out of place’ yet to be fully understood. Even if they do participate, places and institutions such as hostels and guidebooks often don’t aim to rise the ‘self-esteem’ of such travellers, acting as ‘portals’ that enhance the mobilities of some while reinforcing the immobilities of others (Urry, 2007). Research also needs to investigate the sorts of performance and performativity that are denied to certain ‘types’ of persons because they don’t embody the correct ‘taste’ and accomplishments (Ong, 1999), their (sub)cultural capital rendered ineffectual for being embodied in a sexually or racially inferior body (Ong, 1999: 93). Additional research might include:

- How are spaces of consumption such as hostels and other mobility systems spatio-temporally structured into everyday life? To what degree are they key sites for learning and identity work?
- What do social networks reveal about backpackers opportunities to learn, and how might such networks be considered in relation to actual geographic movement?
- How might current methods of studying backpackers be complemented by new technologies such as GPS/GIS technologies, location aware devices and twitter?
- To what extent do backpackers of varying economic, cultural and social contexts, backgrounds, language, geographical location lead to different dispositions, creating fiction between them, since particular knowledge, linguistic behavior, styles and modes of thought and expression might be given various value.
- How are backpacker mobilities and practices structured by adult fear, since parents may finance backpacker mobilities. Does fear and surveillance increase or decrease over the learning trajectory and does adult fear constrain backpacker opportunities to learn and interact?
- Researchers need to investigate new manifestations of and approaches to collectively as the NMP reveals new intentional (or unintentional) mobile cultures and communities. How do imagined worlds (communities) and landscapes of mobility and practice emerge out of ‘flows’? How does a collectivity emerge through the individuals who are part of these movements? Can such a conceptualization be applied to virtual mobility and virtual imagined worlds (communities) such as ‘Second Life’?  

---

168 Second Life is a virtual world developed by Linden Lab and launched on June 23, 2003, and is accessible on the Internet. A free client program called the Viewer enables its users, called Residents, to interact with each other through avatars. Nic Mitham, founder of KZero, a Cambridge (United Kingdom) based consultancy, says that there are 175 virtual worlds that are live or in live beta and that the number of registered users had risen to 880 million in the fourth quarter of 2009 (http://tinyurl.com/23x8pj).
9.5.3 Implications for management action.

The term ‘backpacker’ still has meaning to those who imagine themselves as participants in this world, backpacker discourse\textsuperscript{169} still persuasive and playing a powerful mediating role in human practice, corresponding in some way to the active experience of participants. The myths, images and narratives that surround it continue to be powerful referents, the ‘experience’ of backpacking a growing possibility for dispersed individuals from around the world as a result of the movement of people, images, capital and ideas. However, I argued that varying linguistic, religious and ethno-cultural composition have led to differing media use and learning trajectories across time-space, meaning members of differentially positioned social groups acquire different ‘habituses’ that organise the perceptions, schemes of appreciation that generate dispositions. Since each habitus has its own ‘tradition’ and ‘learning trajectory’ (Wenger, 1998), businesses will have to account for continuity and change, since the different habituses of western, Asian and Israeli backpackers can transform practices and demand differing management response\textsuperscript{170}. Businesses need to distinguish one from another in their body language, their way of speaking, in their tastes in food and for communal activities, and so on. While no single business can fully capture the complexities of the scapes, unique benefits can accrue from seeking to gain a more realistic understanding of backpackers and their everyday world. They must understand their how backpackers see it as a space in which activity occurs and their need for ‘signs’ that convey entry and transition points into this world, portals continually arbitrated by backpackers themselves. Interactions and narratives, for instance, are not simply key resources for mobilising identity, but a means for resources, people, and places to be brought into relationships through networks of mobility (which themselves have varying speeds, rhythms, and frequencies of movements). Businesses need to provide learning opportunities and a sense of place since the scapes are produced through ongoing movement, backpackers not merely ‘situated’ in time-space, but actively learning across time-space–time. Therefore, they also need to recognise the importance of (sub)cultural capital in producing distinction amongst and between backpackers, creating a spectrum between strategic and tactical stances. Businesses will also need to reflect as to whether they will reward elite cultural practices, helping those willing to pay for access through the scapes and become more responsive to the cultural orientations of higher

\textsuperscript{169} The credibility of a discourse is what first makes believers act in accord with it. It produces practitioners. To make people believe is to make them act. But by a curious circularity, the ability to make people act – to write and to machine bodies – is precisely what makes people believe’ (De certeau, 1988: 148; original emphasis).

\textsuperscript{170} The rise of the middle classes in Brazil, India and China will bring about participation and belonging to new worlds (communities) beyond the nation state, participation that might conflict with the demands of citizenship and the mobility politics of the state.
economic classes. Businesses will also need to decide what stance their business should take towards working holiday makers, gapers, flashpackers, positions often rewarded (and often subsidised) by parents, employers and institutions.

9.5.4 Recommendations for management action.

I described in this dissertation a world that is continually contested and being remade, not just by those in the industry or policy makers but backpackers themselves who when playing the ‘game’ with utmost seriousness remain the final arbitrators. While the industry is often quick to accept generalisations, their understanding of the phenomena is often very limited to economic rationale, and do not understand how (sub)cultural capital provides for the smooth, ongoing, normative orderly appearance of member’s recognition, interpretation and understanding of each others activity. For those who play this world (or have participated previously), it may have deep resonance. I argued that durable dispositions can allow individuals to continue to be ‘mobile’ upon their return home, leading to more hybrid identities that illustrate multiple belongings to fluid social and cultural worlds. This belonging may lead to many confirming and demonstrating senses of self that extends beyond both the scope of ‘traditional’ nation-states and citizenship.

By taking one’s dispositions and translating them into other environments, new practices have become relevant, individuals remaining sensitive to worlds to which they have had an intimate and personal engagement. While this engagement might be tentative and provisional, imaginative and virtual, it may also be physical and collective. There are opportunities for businesses to engage with those who have returned home, but wish to remain sensitive to this world, not simply through signifying objects such as digital pictures, flickr accounts and souvenirs, but through signifying practices, many of which may have a corporeal and physical dimension. Holt (1997: 327) describes signifying practices as ‘consumption patterns [that] are conceived as regularities in consumer behaviours, operationalised as the consumption of particular categories of goods and participation categories of leisure activities’. Another area that will have management implications is the use of networked technologies, devices like mobile phones increasingly influencing practices, creating affordances, opportunities and also constraints for particular ways of engaging with the scapes. These technologies of information and communication will become networked and ubiquitous and will become an important element in the performance of contemporary backpacking, influencing practices of moving, dwelling and
9.6 Reflection.

Rather than seeking to reflect on the research process, I want to reflect on the conceptualisations that have arose, which I believe have important resonance beyond backpacking and tourism. I believe the nation state or local governance (or even traditions) are not inherently more democratic and individually empowering than other levels (i.e. global, translocal). Indeed, at a national level, dominant and official discourses about the ‘nation, religion, and civilization that are carefully in line with official language’ (Ong, 1999: 235) often merely create ‘official’ imagined worlds that seek to renew national identities and their perspectives. In many countries or localities, there may be little openings to demonstrate perspectives outside government controlled media, especially for those belonging to a gender / sexual / religious / racial / political minority. While many imagined worlds (communities) are controlled by the state, some worlds might offer a bulwark against official worlds, enabling an individual to stand outside those worlds if the narrative running within them challenges dominant and official discourses that demand ‘persons be locatable and confinable to specific spaces and relations defined by the various regimes: the kinship network, the ‘nation’, the marketplace’ (Ong, 1999: 113). While I looked at one world wherein western alternative imaginaries of movement, dwelling and communication emerged, drawing on narratives of community and an alternative life trajectory, innovations in communications technologies (as the transnational and transnational flows of people, ideas and knowledge within them become resources) mean individuals can design and seek relations that are not based on nation state citizenship, already constituted kinship and/or strong social bonds. From fan groups, flash mobs, temporary activist assemblies, squats, communes to digital swarms, new media can help create communities of sentiment, groups that begin ‘to imagine and feel things together’ (Appadurai, 1996: 3), creating ‘landscapes of group identity... no longer tightly territorialized, spatially bounded, historically unselfconscious, or culturally homogeneous’ (Appadurai, 1996: 48). Changing mobility preferences mean various ways of dwelling, communicating and moving have (re)emerged in relation not only to economic strife and / or alienation, but also because of environmental pressures and technological change, socio-spatial practices that might trend in the future, both in their current forms and when ‘normalised’ for the mainstream tourist industry. While new imaginative possibilities shape lived realities, sustaining mobile populations unrestrained by ideas of spatial boundary and territorial sovereignty, such
worlds may not constitute a felt field, where specific capitals are in play. However, such mobile populations must be further researched. From those who travel from organic farm to farm, new age travellers, biker gangs, pilgrims, cyclists, recreational vehicle owners171 to urban explorers and hitchhikers, people are moving differently than they did in the past, increasingly breaking away from practices that reproduce existing mobility systems, spaces of encounter and consumption, their socio-spatial practices appropriating spaces, places and networks of mobility for cultural meanings. From landscapes of mobility and practice to flash mobs and everyday mobilities, spatial practices or spatial mobilities that have specific cultural meanings might construct, maintain, and circulate myths of imagined worlds (community). While attention is being paid to mobility such as migration and diaspora, more emphasis needs to be placed on temporary mobility that pertains to mobile traits that concern the whole life(style) of an individual, their movement often not dependent on moving faster, farther and more frequently, but mobility choices that welcome turbulence, friction, slower speeds because of the encounters such mobility yields. Researchers must reflect of various imagined worlds (communities) and whether capital is in play, mobility that may create new habituses and new mobile figurations, new patterns of moving, dwelling and communicating refusing to be ‘immobilised’ by national or cultural identities, territories, borders and boundaries. Utilising the practice theories and conceptualisations outlined in this dissertation, researchers must recognise human agency in everyday practices. As long as mobility fantasies exist, as long as it is desired, facilitated, regulated, promoted, packaged and cheered, being-on-move, not least its physical component, mobility will remain a central fact of life, the habitual or extraordinary ways individuals enact, perform, and combine mobility ‘embodiments and enactments of norms, values, and conceptual schemes about time, space, and the social order, so that everyday practices endorse and reproduce these norms’ (Ong, 1999: 5). However, mobility is often packaged and ‘channeled’ into acceptable conduits (since political-economic structures can enable, chanel, and control the flows of people, things, and ideas) so as to facilitate productivity, success, development, connectivity, domination, citizenship, order and predictability. While ‘correct mobilities through the designation of routes’ (Cresswell, 2010: 24) mean individuals are ‘imagined and acted upon by the imperative to consume’ (Miller and Rose, 2008: 114) certain other mobility cultures will still be perceived to be unpredictable and uncontrollable rather than desirable and beneficial (especially if they refuse to be incorporated in the routine rhythms and velocities). While the former will be institutionally supported through

171 There are 70,000 Recreational vehicles (RVs) on the road at any one time in Australia (http://tinyurl.com/359be2h) and according to the Recreation Vehicle Industry Association (RVIA), there are currently 9.3 million RVs on the road in the United States, enjoyed by 30 million enthusiasts.
policy, finance and politics, the latter will be linked to, generating and facilitating risk, insecurity, chaos, disruption, fear, and a threat to society’s order. I have shown through couchsurfing for example that mobility can also exist with relations of reciprocity and solidarity, based on (sub)cultural criteria than has value in multiple class and race stratified settings, but rather than criteria determined by the high status actors, politicians, top executives and scholars, this capital is set in translocal locations around the globe, requiring intra-action by those we once considered hosts or guests, meaning such capital now has international recognition and value in countries of origin and countries of destination.

This dissertation, born out of fresh field data, cutting and pasting, the use of literature and found text, and the willingness to cross and even leave disciplines behind, so as to use any type of discourse and practice theory whatsoever, highlighting my passion as bricoleur, where a lack of respect becomes sublimated (‘to divert the expression of (an instinctual desire or impulse) from its unacceptable form to one that is considered more socially or culturally acceptable’), where a complete disregard of backpacking as ‘tourism’ existed. Rather than stick to procedure or a rigid methodology, I choose to listen, observe, participate and interpret, reading any kind of text, participate in any practice and listen in on any conversation, creating a bricolage that enabled me to look at backpacking afresh, a new kind of collage, however partial and incomplete providing the the researcher as bricoleur with new concepts and tools.
Glossary.

Imagined Worlds (Communities): A great part of his concept is constructed by utilising Benedict Anderson’s (1983) concept of ‘imagined communities’\textsuperscript{172}, and Arjun Appadurai’s (1996) concept of ‘imagined worlds’. The bricoalge enabled me to think about how imagination has a role in a world on the move, where individuals increasingly refuse to be immobilised by national or cultural identities, citizenship or boundaries, where moving images are increasingly meeting mobile audiences. This construct agrees with Anderson who maintains most members of an imagined world will never meet their fellow members (but still feel a sense of communion) and Appadurai’s (1990: 2) ‘constructed landscapes of collective aspirations’ in which localised individuals can envisage global possibilities. As individuals imagine and design their own worlds, often through the prism of new media, worlds can become ‘idealized fantasy scripts for the playing out of identities’ (Nonini, 1999: 62), some of which might be far from an individuals immediate reality. This dissertation is about one particular historically situated formation formed out of a world that was given shape and direction by conscious and beyond conscious forces operating on a collective scale and with a particular purpose. This world, which I term travellerscapes still opens up possibilities for tens of thousands of primarily, but not exclusively young people.

Travellerscapes: Building on Arjun Appadurai’s (1996) framework of landscapes of globalization and Bourdieu’s concepts of field, I argue backpacking works through a system of complex global flows that operate through landscapes of globalisation. I argue the (traveller)scapes emerged through a global disjuncture, in which new kinds of possibilities for subjectivity and agency were formed, creating a new habitual reality for the thousands who drifted east\textsuperscript{173}, a drift soon captured in a new global media as well as guidebooks. The bricoalge enabled me to see these landscapes of mobility and practice forming a domain of deterritorised subjects, which is still a domain in which those who are globalised can engage, benefiting from complex global flows and the opportunities these flows bring. While backpackers may never actually meet every other backpacker in this world, their bodily involvment in the scapes sees them interact with many others in their accumulation of (sub)cultural capital, a conceptualisation that belies the existence of a relatively autonomous field within which specific capital can be accumulated and validated. It is a

\textsuperscript{172} ‘How can it be otherwise for a nation that was born of imagination, erected on human dreams and has created a network of internal, unseen information to reach beyond herself?’ (Bah Kah Choon in Ong, 1999: 55).

\textsuperscript{173} ‘For the man-in-the-street, most versions [of the world] from science, art, and perception, depart in some ways from the familiar serviceable world he has jerry-built from fragments of scientific and artistic tradition and from his own struggle for survival. This world, indeed, is the one most often taken as real; for reality in a world, like realism in a picture, is largely a matter of habit’ (Goodson, 1978: 20).
field that has a large degree of autonomy with a form of capital specific to the field and containing agents positioned relative to each other. Its accumulation requires particular commitment and seriousness, where strategic to tactical stances create a set of positions and competitive orientations.

(Sub)cultural Capital: Sarah Thornton’s (1995) study ‘Club Cultures’ looked at the development of large dance parties (raves) and related musical styles (techno and house) through the club movement in Britain from the late eighties and into the early nineties, using the concept of cultural capital by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu to develop the concept of (sub)cultural capital. Thornton describes ‘subcultural capital’ as providing status to an individual in his or her own social world. I extended this concept beyond its initial use in youth leisure, entertainment and fashion to argue for its use within backpacking, a concept that could also be applied to alternative means of moving, dwelling and even communicating. While so called ‘mass’ or ‘mainstream’ tourists ‘regulate’ their movement in a strategic sense as they accumulate a destinations cultural capital, their mobility related ‘practices’ strategically engineered through powerful discursive media, their mobility often intensified by transport and service providers who offer access to peoples, places and cultures in all corners of the globe, I argue from field research that alternative means of moving, dwelling and communicating (some of which act as counterpoints to mainstream tourism) depends on an alternative conceptualisation of capital. Rather than living in mobility fantasies, individuals who have a self-conscious awareness of alternative worlds can construct, in relation to themselves and others, new ways of being, thinking, acting, moving, dwelling and communicating, that does not build upon old social, cultural, and economic capital. I argue that within their social world, backpackers must exploit (sub)cultural capital that cannot be easily purchased. Bourdieu defines ‘cultural capital’ as ‘the unequal distribution of cultural practices, values and competencies characteristic of capitalist societies’ (Shuker, 2002: 77) and is largely defined through upbringing and background to give people who accumulate a destinations capital social prestige, status, power and standing. However, I argue that (sub)cultural capital, its accumulation, embodiment and communication is a by-product of individual activity and labour, establishing a hierarchy through which adherence to the logic of the travellerscapes are policed. While (sub)cultural capital exists in three forms (embodied, objectified and institutionalised), backpackers largely seek to attain objectified and embodied capital which is encapsulated within the temporal, social and spatial context of the scapes, capital that might encompass general cultural awareness to (sub)cultural knowledge. I distinguish
between objectified (sub)cultural capital which is primarily connected with collecting knowledge and places, and embodied (sub)cultural capital which refers to the embodiment of (sub)cultural knowledge, specific competencies and skills, accumulated so as to be seen and recognised as a competent, legitimate, credible and relevant actor.

The criteria of what counts as objectified capital are relatively robust and must be accumulated and communicated (via stories) in an effort to be different from others, demonstrating one’s belonging to this world. Indeed, it is a world where economic capital cannot be relied upon for conversion into (sub)cultural capital, and if individuals were to buy into such worlds, they might often lack the dispositions to decode and manipulate the competencies required for certain practices and performances. However, such (sub)cultural capital can be depleted due to overexposure. As more ‘tourists’ learn about particular places, events and so on, the capital runs out, but rather than imploding, I argue that in the fierce competition between backpackers, people have time and space to maneuver given the right confidence and competencies to negotiate the boundaries of the scapes. Once (sub)cultural capital is embodied as part of the habitus, a social agent will have a bodily and pre-reflexive sense of what is appropriate and valued conduct in a given context, realising reality can be changed by the way they engage the scapes. From how they use their bodies, through their sense of time or upping the ante to accumulate capital and distinction (seen to be so by relevant others), the scapes are continually remade. Using the example of couchsurfing, I also extend the concept, since individuals can acquire such capital through new social contacts (social capital), since contacts based on (social) reciprocity can expose individuals to (sub)cultural capital (knowledge, hospitality and information are handed over via networks as social capital), potentially increasing stocks of (sub)cultural capital by deepening and broadening cultural knowledge. These networks aren’t based on friendship, school ties, professional contacts or family, but ‘weak ties’ influenced by pre-existing cultural orientations through the principle of homophily (general tendency for people to ‘seek out’ and prefer the company of those ‘like themselves’) (Southerton, 2004: 99-100).

**Backpacker Habitus:** I argue that once individuals seek to belong to the scapes, they must master certain kinds of practical action which derive from moving within, amongst and between the particular social relations and practices available to them in their part of the social field. Internalising norms through practice, repeatedly having to act within specific kinds of social relations and context so that they acquire the appropriate dispositions, and a
feel for the game, I describe how (sub)cultural capital is produced, accumulated and embodied by the struggles between individuals within the scapes, interplay between backpackers over what should or should not be considered ‘good taste’, a continual struggle. While much objectified (sub)cultural capital is produced by those with symbolic power (i.e. guidebooks\textsuperscript{174}), high status who in a creative interplay with the rest of the world can force consensus on the value of objectified (sub)cultural capital. While those beginning their journey accumulate objectified capital in a strategic way\textsuperscript{175} as they monitor their practice and performance of backpacking, I argue by modifying the habitus concept, that there is room for individual reflexivity, leading to the capacity to behave in ways that are not necessarily accommodating to the dominant social relations or discourses within which they are located. Backpackers, I argue, become locked into relations of conflict and cooperation, as they constantly renegotiate and rework their position in the scapes, some of whom after much practical experience mediate ‘the role that objective structural or cultural powers play in influencing social action and are thus indispensable to explaining social outcomes’ (Archer, 2007: 5). Therefore, I describe the habitus with a depth and breadth that matches that of the scapes, arguing that there is strategic and tactical positioning across the entire spectrum of conflict and co-operation. Extending de Certeau’s description of strategic and tactical manouevring using field data, I furnish their manouevring’s in much detail. Finally, I argue that those who play with utmost seriousness can acquire constitutive dispositions (acquired consciously and beyond consciously) that can be mobilised upon a backpackers return home, their mobilisation in particular contexts highlighting new inclinations and aversions which blur boundaries between home and away, tourism and everyday life.

\textsuperscript{174} While guidebooks like the Lonely Planet retain symbolic capital (and the Wheelers (sub)cultural capital), its status within the scapes is can be future proofed or guaranteed.

\textsuperscript{175} It is, of course, never ruled out that the responses of the habitus may be accompanied by a strategic calculation tending to perform in a conscious mode the operation that the habitus performs quite differently… But these responses are first defined, without any calculation, in relation to objective potentialities, immediately inscribed in the present, things to do or not to do, things to say or not to say’ (Bourdieu, 1990a: 53).
Bibliography.


Hetherington, K. (1992). 'Stonehenge and Its Festival: Spaces of Consumption'. In Shields,


Routledge.


Ki-Moon, B. (2009). Opening address of H.E. Mr. Ban ki-Moon, secretary general of the united nation sat the third global forum on migration and development. Athens - 4 November 2009. [Accessed 03-10-09]


Marcos, Subcomandante (2003). Our word is our weapon: selected writings, Seven Stories Press.


Richards, G. and King, B. (2003). ‘Youth Travel and Backpacking’, *Travel and Tourism Analyst*. vol.6, Dec, pp. 1-23


Roget, P.M. (1857). *Thesaurus of English words and phrases, classified so as to facilitate the expression of ideas*, Oxford University.


371


372


