GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET

INST FÖR KULTURVETENSKAPER

Tourist or traveller?

A study on social categorisation among non-residents in Gothenburg

Name: Agnes Karnatz

Programme: Cultural sciences, bachelor's programme

Course: Bachelor thesis in cultural sciences

Supervisor: Andreas Nordin

Examiner: Thomas Bossius

Semester: Spring 2016

Abstract

Title: Tourist or traveller – a study on social categorisation among non-residents in Gothenburg

Author: Agnes Karnatz

E-mail: agn.kar.ak@gmail.com

Spring 2016

Department of Cultural Sciences, Gothenburg University

Supervisor: Andreas Nordin

Examiner: Thomas Bossius

The purpose of this paper is to examine how non-residents in Gothenburg categorise themselves and why, relating to the concept of "a tourist". The aim is thus to investigate the perception of being a tourist in a western city through how people define the concept and what social status it has today.

To do this theories based in psychology, philosophy and cultural studies are used. These are: the social identity theory, high and low culture-theory and Bourdieu's symbolic capital, along with a philosophical perspective on role identification. Said theories are used to analyse the empirical material, which consists of several interviews with a group of respondents.

The analysis indicates that, since none of the respondents would categorise themselves as a tourist, being a tourist is a low form of culture in the particular context that the respondents were in. Tourists as a group also have social power, since they are considered important and positive for a city. However, this only applies to the respondents' definition of a tourist, which the researchers referred to in this paper and the tourism industry would only consider to be one of the many types of urban tourist. The perception of a tourist thus differs depending on whether you ask the respondents (here representing people in general) or professionals within the field.

Keywords: urban tourism, Gothenburg, role identification, social identity theory, high and low culture, symbolic capital.

Thank you: Slottsskogens vandrarhem, the respondents, my proofreader and friends who have helped me with this paper.

Table of contents

Disposition

This paper consists of eight chapters and one appendix. Following the introductory chapter, consisting of all information necessary to understand the purpose along with background and previous research, is the chapter presenting and motivating the theories used to analyse the material. Here the central concepts are also defined and explained. Thereafter, the methods for collecting data and the sources are presented and motivated in chapter 3. Next follows a summary of the data collected through the interviews, which will make up the foundation for the analysis. No data will be analysed that is not presented in chapter 4.

    The following analysis is then divided into two parts: chapter 5 and 6. In chapter 5, the results are analysed firstly on their own (meaning conclusions will be drawn exclusively on the basis of the results), and secondly through the theories presented in chapter 2. In chapter 6, the second part of the analysis is based on the information presented in chapter 1.2 and 1.3 (previous research and background information on the tourism industry in Gothenburg). These materials are first compared with each other, in order to decide whether the previous research can actually be used on data collected in Gothenburg. Then the conclusions from chapter 5 are put in front of this background, and an analysis aiming for a wider perspective is made. All conclusions are then summarised in chapter 7, where possible effects are also presented, along with suggestions for further research. The final chapter presents literature and other sources that have been used in the writing of this paper. The finishing appendix consists of pictures referred to in the paper.

1 Introduction

"Travelers have several cities they call home"

"Travelers have the key to hidden places"

"Travelers don't use guidebooks – they create their own"

– SAS 2016

In 2014, the airline SAS (Scandinavian Airlines) launched a long-time commercial concept named "We are travelers[1]". The idea was to aim for the people who travel several times each year, and to make travelling by plane seem attractive for these people (Thambert 2016). In January 2016 the concept was still running, but with updated commercial posters on bus stops and advertising signs (view appendix). The messages on the posters seem to tell us that travelling is something casual, yet exciting. Those who travel feel at home in several cities and can move around without guidebooks, and by doing this they can discover "hidden places". The posters are clearly including the intended group of people who are used to travelling, but whom are they excluding? What group of people are the hidden places hiding for? And what about those who do not feel comfortable in a foreign city without guidebooks? Should they choose another airline?

According to my definition in this paper an urban tourist is someone who travels to a city for pleasure purposes (view chapter 2.3.1). This would certainly apply to the people SAS describe in their posters, but it could also be someone they are excluding. For what reason have SAS chosen the word "traveler" instead of "tourist"? It could be because they want to target a certain group of customers, but could it also be that they want to avoid the thoughts and stereotypes connected with tourists? In this paper I am looking further at whether this could have been the reason that prevented SAS from using the word "tourist" in their posters. I would like to know whether people visiting a city (in this case Gothenburg) would rather identify with something other than a tourist, and in that case why. Further, I would like to compare this with how tourists are defined by previous research in the field and by the tourism industry, in order to see if they differ from the visiting people and in that case what effect these differences might have. Will the dictionary definition of a tourist thus be further challenged by others than SAS?

---

[1] SAS is using the American spelling of "traveler", which will here occur within quotation marks, as I am using the British spelling (traveller) throughout the paper in general.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine how a limited group of non-residents in Gothenburg categorise themselves and why, relating to the concept of being a tourist.

1.1.1 Research questions

- How many of the respondents categorise themselves as tourists?
- Was tourist a possible choice for those who did not?
- What status do tourists have among the respondents, and does this affect how they categorise themselves?
- How do the respondents' perception and definition of a tourist apply to previous research and the tourism industry?

1.1.2 Demarcations

The time and resources to do this study are finite, and therefore it is necessary to have some demarcations. The first concerns place: the study was made exclusively at the hostel "Slottsskogens vandrarhem" in Olivedal, Gothenburg. This is because I had neither the resources to cover other cities as well, nor the time to search for other hostels or hotels that would allow me to interview their guests. I interviewed six non-residents in Gothenburg between January 29th and February 4th of 2016, meaning the study was not conducted during tourist season (which is in the summer). Moreover, since the study is qualitative and does not claim to draw general conclusions, it is advantageous to make the selection of respondents as narrow as possible, because then the conclusions will at least be valid for that particular group of people at that specific time and place.

Considering these demarcations in time and place, along with the purpose and research questions, there are some things this study will not attempt to draw conclusions about. Firstly, as underlined above, the results will only be completely valid for that particular group of respondents and for the specific time and place in which the study was made. Indications on what these conclusions might mean for other times and places will, however, be made. Secondly, the study will not answer questions about tourism outside of cities, or in cities dissimilar from Gothenburg. Also, it will not be possible to examine perspectives that are not represented in the results, such as the ones of Gothenburg residents or people working with tourism. All adjacent questions not answered here will be left for further research to examine.

1.2 Background: the tourism industry in Gothenburg

The background of this study consists of an overview of the official tourism industry in Gothenburg. The company in charge of managing the marketing and development of the city toward tourists is Göteborg & Co (Gadd 2010), which is owned by the Gothenburg municipality, the Gothenburg region and several business corporations and associations in the city (Holmkvist 2010:37). The current CEO of Göteborg & Co is Camilla Nyman, who talks about what is important for the city in order to attract more tourists in an interview with the daily newspaper Göteborgs-Posten in 2014. She paints a picture of three legs for the city to stand on: "the tourist city, the meeting city and the event city". The meeting city attracts the visitors who spend the most money (business travellers), while the event city gets attention from other cities and countries. The tourist city overlaps and provides an income for the tourism industry on weekends and holidays. Nyman also talks about the residents' role in attracting visitors to Gothenburg. She says that if the people who live in Gothenburg are friendly and welcoming, the visitors will feel the same way about the city. This means that problems, such as crime and gang fights, will only affect the tourism if the residents change their behaviour in a negative way because of it (Hugo 2014).

Göteborg & Co underlines that trademarks and attractions are important if a city wants to attract tourists. Strong such ones in Gothenburg are exemplified as the amusement park Liseberg and the west coast of Sweden itself, where people enjoy spending their summers (Gadd 2010), and in 2021 Gothenburg will celebrate its 4th centennial, which gives Göteborg & Co an opportunity to make the city better. They want to develop the city with new collaborations to improve the situation both for residents and visitors, says former CEO Sabine Söndergaard (2011). But some are not too impressed by Göteborg & Co's marketing of the city's trademarks. Representatives from the political opposition in Gothenburg want to enhance "the meeting city" more. This consists of, they argue, an openness toward people from other cultures, and also the image of Gothenburg residents as being generous and happy (Engström, Hansson & Ossiansson 2010).

1.3 Grounded theory

Previous research within the field of urban tourism is not mainly connected to cultural studies. The field is instead primarily dealt with within the economic sciences (Jansen-Verbeke 1986; Page 1995; Maitland 2006; Smith 2006; Ågren 2013), presumably because of its status as a major source of income for cities and the tourism industry. However, these scientists are – as I

am – interested in knowing how non-residents in cities think and behave. Though in the case of previous research this is in order to optimise the tourism industry, and in my case it is to understand the status and perception of being a tourist. Of course, this does not apply to all the previous research I am using. Some take other perspectives, such as asking questions about how the tourist or visitor uses social networks on the internet (Kim & Tussyadiah 2013).

The fact that previous research is not mainly connected to cultural studies will not be a disadvantage for this study, since it will not be based on said research, only compared with it. On the other hand, it is now even more interesting to see whether my conclusions verify results from another scientific field.

1.3.1 Previous research

The research in the field of urban is often based on statistics from the tourism industry and quantitative studies (Page 1995:58). Many researchers agree on the assumption that tourism in cities is changing (Jansen-Verbeke 1986:80ff, Maitland 2006:25f, Ågren 2013:247f). This change consists of more day visits in cities (without spending the night) (Jansen-Verbeke 1986:80ff), and of the tourist's search for a specific experience, which draws the attention toward other parts of the city than the natural tourist areas (Maitland 2006:25f). At the same time more focus is put on selling the city as a metropolis on the market, to attract business travellers rather than leisure tourists (Ågren 2013:251ff).

When it comes to defining an urban tourist, the professor emerita and lecturer in geography and tourism at the Catholic University of Leuven Myriam Jansen-Verbeke argues that a tourist is anyone who comes from outside the inner city service centre and visits mainly for leisure purposes. This means that one can be a tourist in one's own city if one happens to live in a suburban area (Jansen-Verbeke 1986:83f). One who *does* live in the city centre and spends time there for leisure purposes, Jansen-Verbeke would call a recreationalist (Jansen-Verbeke 1986:88). Robert Maitland, Director of the Centre for Tourism at the University of Westminster, differentiates within the concept of "tourist". There are mass tourists who want to visit the regular tourist areas, with museums, famous restaurants and other attractions that the city is promoting. Such areas are often standardised and therefore show little of the local culture (Maitland 2006:26f). There are also the post-tourists (or new tourists). These want to experience what is specific and authentic for the particular city they are visiting. They are used to travelling and therefore the regular tourist areas are something they have seen before. However, most visitors in western cities nowadays are business travellers and visitors of

residents in the city (such as friends and family). Both these groups have access to local people who can provide them with information about the city that is not available for the mass tourist, who has to rely on more public sources. Because of this, it is now more difficult to separate the activities of visitors and residents, since they overlap to a much greater extent than previously (Maitland 2006:27ff).

Furthermore, Maitland continues, separating tourists from residents is becoming less and less important, since they do the same things and care about the same things. They want quality of living rather than spectacular and famous attractions (Maitland 2006:30ff). For this reason the focus in the tourism industry has shifted slightly. One example of this is Stockholm. Karin Ågren, researcher in economic history, overlooks the history of the tourism industry in the Swedish capital. She underlines a great shift in the industry's ambitions in the 1980s. Before that, the goal was to make the tourist's experience as good as possible, but after the shift the industry started seeing visitors as producers (Ågren 2013:247f). Now they could also work toward business travellers, a group which became more and more important for the economy (Ågren 2013:31f). Along with this change, the commercial slogan for Stockholm switched from focusing on the water and archipelago to "The capital of Scandinavia" (Ågren 2013:65). The new slogan aims for international visitors – business travellers in particular – as it pictures Stockholm as an important metropolis rather than as something beautiful and enjoyable (Ågren 2013:251ff).

When it comes to what characterises Gothenburg many people talk about the events (Hugo 2014). Senior lecturer in tourism at the University of Westminster Andrew Smith explains how such events actually affect the amount of tourists in a city. The bigger positive aspects are, Smith claims, that events can help industrial cities compete with more established tourist cities at the same time as they make room for improving the city for the future. One can also use the right sort of event to attract the right sort of visitor (Smith 2006:85ff). A drawback can be that the ordinary tourists avoid the city while the event is in progress, due to large crowds of event visitors. These crowds might not even spend much time and money outside of the event either. However, when the event is over the amount of tourists increases (Smith 2006:91ff). This is because the city receives a lot of attention because of the event, which attracts tourists who are not interested in the event itself (Smith 2006:97f).

Furthermore, an aspect that is fully present in today's travelling is social networks based on the internet. Jeongmi Kim and Iis Tussyadiah, representing School of Tourism and Hospitality Management at Temple University and the University of Southern Denmark, discuss in their article the impact of these social networks on the travelling experience. For

instance, social networks can provide tourists with support which decreases the insecurity of being a foreign city. This support can come both from familiar and unfamiliar people (Kim & Tussyadiah 2013:80f). At the same time the tourist can keep in touch with people from home, which makes it less stressful to be far away (Kim & Tussyadiah 2013:88).

2 Theories

This paper is written within the scientific field of cultural studies, which means its primary focus is humans in society. In this paper the humans will mainly be non-residents in Gothenburg, and the society will be western cities in general and the city of Gothenburg in particular. However, the theories I will use to fulfill my purpose are not solely based in cultural studies. I am also using psychological and philosophical theories to analyse my material. This is necessary if I am to be able to use the cultural theories to their full extent. Since my purpose is to analyse why my respondents categorise themselves as they do, I must first understand how they do this. That is where the psychology and philosophy come in. My conclusions will be more well-grounded if I do not simply accept what the respondents are saying, but also support or deny their claims with theories, as well as explain them. After doing so, the foundation for using cultural theories will be firmer.

The theories thus make up two angles. The first one is psychological/philosophical, and it will help me to analyse how the respondents are assuming whichever social role they choose for themselves, as well as partly explain why or why not they assume the role of a tourist. The second angle consists of the theory of high and low culture, as well as symbolic capital. These theories will be the other part in explaining why or why not the respondents choose the role of a tourist, for example by examining what status this role might have. This angle will also help me to evaluate my results in relation to previous research.

2.1 Psychological/philosophical perspectives

One can approach the issue of people identifying with social roles from different angles. In this study I have chosen the social identity theory, which is based in psychology, and a philosophical view on role-identification. These two approaches are the most appropriate that I have found for my purpose. They also give a bigger and a smaller picture on the issue, since social identity theory mainly treats groups and group behaviour (Turner & Reynolds 2010:15), while the philosophical view focuses on what is happening in our minds when we assume a social role (Sciaraffa 2009:107). The philosophical perspective is not a specific theory. Instead, it is a relatively new discussion between Stefan Sciaraffa, professor of philosophy at McMaster University, and A. John Simmons, professor of philosophy and law at the University of Virginia, in which Sciaraffa opposes Simmons' view on our normative relation to social roles (Sciaraffa 2009:108). The advantage of this philosophical discussion is that it is accurate toward the purpose of this paper, and it is also more recent than the social identity theory.

2.1.1 Social identity theory

In 1971 social identity theory was founded by the social psychologist Henri Tajfel. He found a new perspective on social psychology necessary in order to draw meaningful conclusions of the data from social categorisation on behaviour between groups (Turner & Reynolds 2010:13f). In general, social identity theory could use group psychology as a way to explain racism, prejudice and conflict (Turner & Reynolds 2010:15). The theory has grown more and more popular, since today we have many ways of changing and gaining new social identities (Postmes & Branscombe 2010:1ff).

The foundation of social identity theory is that a person always wants to have a satisfactory image of themselves. When we compare ourselves with others we try to do it in our own favour. When we join a social group, that group affects our image of ourselves negatively or positively. This Tajfel calls social categorisation; bringing together social aspects in groups, and thereby confirming one's beliefs and intentions (Tajfel 2010:79f). This defines a person's place in society, and affects the social identity, but should not be confused with it. Social identity, on the other hand, comes from the emotional significance a person places on membership in a social group, and through this it helps defining the person's self-concept. Seeking membership in a group can therefore be a way of adding something positive to a social identity. For the same reason a person can avoid or leave a social group with negative associations (Tajfel 2010:80).

In order to dissociate oneself from another group, a person can create or enhance differences between the groups. This can further add order and meaning to group membership (Tajfel 2010:84f), and it can also make way for the person's tendency to dislike members of the other group: it is only possible to dislike members of other groups if a person has a sense of belonging to his or her group, and if there is a clear distinction between the two groups (Tajfel 2010:78).

2.1.2 Philosophical view on role-identification

In opposing Simmons, Sciaraffa claims that every social role is bound to a goal. Several social roles in clusters have a common goal, which they help each other to fulfill (Sciaraffa 2009:109). To identify with a social role entails having a comprehensive goal, which is to aim toward what you want to *be*, not what you want to *do*. When one assumes a role one also assumes the connected comprehensive goal. One conceives that the goal is important for being the kind of person one wants to be, or the goal might actually be directly important to one (Sciaraffa 2009:111f). However, the comprehensive goal cannot be just any goal; it also

has to be rational to the person identifying with it. The meaning of the role needs a specific value. This meaning also provides a person's subjective experience with structure (Sciaraffa 2009:114f). Along with the social role come duties (Sciaraffa 2009:119). These duties can be internal within the role, but there are also duties that are natural and independent of the role (Sciaraffa 2009:125f). In conclusion, identifying with a social role means life gets meaning, goals and duties, which one shares with others in the same cluster of roles.

2.2 High and low culture

Many researchers and theorists have used the concept of high and low culture in their work (Bru 2012; Brottman 2005). There are many authors who use the theory in their writings, but fewer who puts the main focus on it. This might be because it can be considered a simple and easily understandable theory. The concept of the theory is that low culture (or popular culture) is consumed by the lower and wider realms of society, and is also created mainly to make profit. High culture, on the other hand, is consumed by a smaller, highly regarded group, and has deeper and more complex meaning to it than does low culture (Bru & van Nujis 2012:3-10).

In this study I have chosen to mix one old and one new writing on the theory, by T.S. Eliot (1962) and Mikita Brottman (2005). My intention here is to use one interpretation that is, presumably, relatively unaffected by other perspectives on the theory (Eliot 1962), and one interpretation that is consciously and purposely affected by others (Brottman 2005). In connection with this theory I have also decided to use Pierre Bourdieu's theory on symbolic capital, which treats how we acknowledge authority in small or large amount to a kind of social role or group. Bourdieu uses the idea of high and low culture in the form of capital, where capital gives the status of high culture and little or no capital gives the status of low culture (Bourdieu 1999). This is a more concrete theory (meaning it has more specific guidelines) than high and low culture, and therefore the theories complement each other. By using both of them my analysis will thus, presumably, be more stable.

2.2.1 T.S. Eliot

One of the earlier writers who talked about high and low culture is T.S. Eliot. In his work *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (first edition 1948) he attempts to get closer to the definition of the word "culture" (Eliot 1962:13). He claims that the higher level of culture is more conscious, but it is still the same amount of culture as the lower. The higher level of culture is practiced by the "élites", and enriches the other levels of culture, at the same time as

it holds value in itself. The movement of culture can therefore be described as a cycle. However, Eliot brings forth a problem with the higher level of culture; the practicing élites are more and more isolated from each other, which negatively affects the contact and mutual influences on the lower levels (Eliot 1962:37f). Eliot also describes levels of culture as levels of power, where the smaller group at a higher level has the same power as the larger group at a lower level. This makes the levels of culture equal, and everyone therefore has the same amount of responsibility for the culture. The responsibilities are merely portioned out in different areas of the democratic society (Eliot 1962:48).

2.2.2 Mikita Brottman

In more recent days the scholar, psychoanalyst, author and cultural critic Mikita Brottman bears witness to academics finding it more and more interesting to study the lower culture, which she chooses to call popular culture. The problem here is that the usual methods used when studying cultural material might not be appropriate for popular culture, since it is not considered substantial enough to give an outright response to intellectual treatment (Brottman 2005:XIf). However, Brottman points out that what we consider high culture literature classics were, in fact, popular once. Here, Brottman's definition of popularity is how many that are consuming the culture, as opposed to who is consuming it. But this definition is not universal, Brottman concedes, since high culture can attract a lot of people just as popular culture can be disliked by the greater crowd (Brottman 2005:XIIf).

2.2.3 Pierre Bourdieu

The sociologist, anthropologist and philosopher Pierre Bourdieu founded the theory of symbolic capital. This theory treats a system of social power, where symbolic capital consists of acknowledged authority within one or several types of capital (or characteristics). Therefore a person can only have symbolic capital if people around value the characteristics of the person. If one is in a situation where one's characteristics are not acknowledged, one does not receive symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1999:97). Capital can be used in order to differentiate and arrange different kinds of people connected to certain characteristics. Bourdieu claims that in "developed societies" one can use cultural and economic capital as main principals in this arrangement. However, in society there is a risk of incorrectly differentiating between similar characteristics, or to equate characteristics that are different according to the arrangement structure. This is because distinction only exists in relation to other characteristics (Bourdieu 1999:15f).

People who belong to a certain capital or characteristic follow practices connected to that capital. The practices follow the principals of what Bourdieu calls habitus. Habitus decides what you eat, your interests and your political opinion. People in a society register differences between practices and arrange them as symbolic differences in a system (Bourdieu 1999:19). In short, according to the theory of symbolic capital, we register a person's practices (which are decided by their habitus) and decide which characteristic he or she has or what type of capital he or she possesses. If we value the characteristics or capital we give the person symbolic capital and thereby authority.

2.3 Central concepts
Some words and concepts are more essential than others in this paper. Therefore I will define and explain them here, in order to avoid any misinterpretation.

2.3.1 Urban tourist
Part of this paper's purpose is to practically examine how the official definition of an "urban tourist", which is made by previous research (chapter 1.3.1), matches the result of my interviews. This will mean that a new definition of the concept "urban tourist" will be created according to my results and presented along with my other conclusions. However, some sort of definition for the word is necessary as a base for this paper. This definition of the urban tourist that I have chosen is "a person who travels to a city for pleasure purposes". The definition corresponds with the definition of the word "tourist" in the Merriam-Webster dictionary (Merriam-Webster 2016) and does not negate any of the definitions made in the chapter on previous research in this paper.

2.3.2 Culture
In analysing the results of this paper, a tourist will be considered as a cultural phenomenon. Thereby the theories treating culture in general will be applied to tourists and specifically to urban tourists. This draws support from the assumption that everything created or thought of by people is culture.

2.3.3 Social group
The concept of social group will appear several times in this paper, sometimes in the shape of the specific group of "urban tourists". The definition for this I receive from Henri Tajfel, who is also founder of one of the main theories I will use. The definition of a social group is therefore a group of people, which is perceived as having common or equal characteristics or

goals. This would be in comparison with other groups in the same environment (Tajfel 2010:82).

3 Methods

The methods and material used to fulfill the purpose of this study are interviews and the data collected from them. They will here be presented and discussed.

3.1 A qualitative study

The purpose of this paper is to examine how people categorise themselves in social roles, which means I have to find out *how* these people think when they do this, and *why* they do not choose another role. In order to fulfill this purpose I have chosen to collect my own data by confronting people directly, since I have not been able to find previous studies or documents with the materials needed. When confronting people, the purpose has to be divided into several questions which are easier for the respondents to understand and answer. It is also desirable for me to be able to ask these questions in different ways, depending on the situation for the respondent, and to pose supplementary questions in case I did not understand the answer or want a clearer one. If this purpose is to be fulfilled, it is important that the respondents understand what I want to know, and also that I understand what the respondents are actually saying.

Considering this is the kind of data I will need as well as the amount of time allotted to me for this study (approximately 9 weeks), I have chosen to conduct a qualitative study by interviewing a small group of people. This will not provide me with enough data to draw general conclusions as a quantitative study with a written survey might have done. However, a qualitative study with interviews will provide me with greater accuracy in the data that I do have, and on the basis of this I can see indications of what the result of a wider survey might be. Moreover, looking at previous research in the field of urban tourism, most conclusions are based on statistics from the tourism industry and quantitative studies (Page 1995:58). Therefore it would be desirable to complete this research with a qualitative study such as this one.

3.2 Changing the original plan

In order to make this study as accurate as possible, considering the limited amount of data I would be able to get, I wanted to interview non-residents in Gothenburg who were actually in the city while being interviewed. This would take away the factor of having to rely on respondents' memory of how they felt when they once were in Gothenburg as non-residents. But how was I to find these respondents?

Gothenburg is big enough to have people visiting all year round, even outside of tourist season. My challenge was to create an opportunity for me to make contact with non-residents and convince them to spend some of their time on giving me an interview. My original plan was to consciously choose one respondent from each of these three types: business traveller, person visiting friends or family, and person visiting Gothenburg without connection to residents. I based the respondent types on visitor groups made by previous research (Maitland 2006:26ff). The idea with this plan was to compare the results from each type of non-residents, creating an opportunity for more conclusions and, I thought, giving my study greater width. I also thought about combining observations with my interviews, watching how the respondents behaved and moved around, in order to support the interview material I would receive.

However, after not finding any respondents this way, I decided to change my method of making contact with respondents. The original plan was also pointless in other ways, since I would not be able to draw more general conclusions based on three respondents anyway – neither by comparing them nor as a group. Using the original plan would also mean that I based my entire study on assuming the previous research was valid in this context. And observations would not be accurate toward my purpose, I decided, since it would put too much focus on the respondents' behaviour, rather than their thoughts.

Therefore I decided to make the process of finding respondents simpler and less predetermined. I was going to make contact with people from the same place, a place with high probability of housing non-residents in Gothenburg: a hostel or hotel. Then my conclusions would at least be valid for the group of respondents at that time and place, and the categories from previous research could be applied afterwards, and would therefore not affect the results.

3.3 Field work: preparations and interviews

The hostel Slottsskogens vandrarhem, in the part of Gothenburg called Olivedal, gave me permission to search for respondents among their guests. I then had to consider the fact that a hostel, being cheaper than a hotel, likely attracts a certain kind of guest. However, this particular hostel has many different kinds of accommodation, such as apartments, rooms with access to common kitchen and bathrooms, as well as a possibility to pay for prepared breakfast. This would also mean that the likelihood of my meeting several different kinds of guest was relatively high.

Within a week from starting my search I had conducted all the interviews I needed, with six respondents in total. All interviews were conducted spontaneously, except for one which was planned. All of the interviews took place in eating areas at the hostel; a relatively neutral place where the respondents still had an advantage, since they were staying at the hostel and I was not. I used a recorder while interviewing, to make it easier for me to concentrate on the answers and to make the study more accurate, as I would be able to listen to the interviews several times while transcribing. All but one interview were conducted in Swedish, which forced me to translate them for the presentation in chapter 4. Original quotes in Swedish can be found in footnotes. Two of the respondents were interviewed together, because of the fact that they were there as each other's company. This has been considered in my analysis, and should be kept in mind by the reader of this paper as well.

The interviews ended up being between 5 and 20 minutes long, depending on how much the respondents were willing to talk. I asked questions about why the respondents were in Gothenburg, what title they would like to have during their stay (if it was not "tourist" I asked why not), and what their thoughts were about tourists in general. Some respondents gave me short answers and did not seem to want to think more about their opinions, while others told stories and discussed back and forth with themselves about, for example, what might define a tourist. All the respondents thus answered the questions fully, but some using more words than others.

I considered all guests staying at the hostel for a shorter time relevant for my study. What categorisation they chose for themselves did not matter, since my purpose includes everyone who is not a resident in Gothenburg. These people have at least some things in common with a tourist, according to my definition in chapter 2.3.1, and therefore their reason for being or not being a tourist is one of the more interesting parts of my study.

3.4 Ethical considerations

All the respondents in this study were first of all informed about who I was, the purpose of the paper and how their material was going to be used. They were always given the choice not to be interviewed, or to be interviewed without being recorded. After the respondents had accepted to take part in the study, I informed them about their rights; they could choose not to answer a question if they did not want to, they were able to change their mind about taking part even after the interview was finished, and they could read the completed version of the paper if they wanted to.

All the respondents have been made as anonymous as possible. Only such personal details as would be necessary for analysing the result of the study were asked for during the interview, such as city of residence, reason for travelling to Gothenburg, other travelling habits and, sometimes, profession. No information about name, age, sex or other details that can be used to trace the respondents will be presented in this paper. The information I received from the respondents during the interviews will be used only in this study.

3.5 Sources

The main source for this study is the interviews. The literature I am using to find theories and research, which are used to analyse my material, consists of printed and published material, either in the shape of books or established journals. I am also mainly using the primary literature to theories and research (Tajfel 2010; Sciaraffa 2009; Eliot 1962; Bourdieu 1999; Jansen-Verbeke 1986; Maitland 2006; Smith 2006), meaning I have studied works by the theorist or researcher who founded it themselves, and not works by other writers about the theory or research. However, I am also using secondary literature in order to get an overview on some theories and research (Ågren 2013; Brottman 2005; Bru & van Nujis 2012). This literature is used as complementary sources to the primary literature.

The main theorists used in this paper are Tajfel, Eliot and Bourdieu, who are all established theorists or writers within their field. However, their works are relatively old, which is why I am also using more recent writings by Sciaraffa, Brottman and Bru & van Nujis. They are all contemporary scholars at different universities. The same goes for most of the researchers presented in chapter 1.3.1.

As this study focuses on Gothenburg, I have created an overview of the city's tourism industry (chapter 1.2). This overview is based on reportages and articles published in the well-established local newspaper *Göteborgs-Posten* or the media and marketing focused journal *Resumé* (Gadd 2010; Holmkvist 2010; Hugo 2014; Söndergaard 2011; Engström, Hansson & Ossiansson 2010). Debating articles were written by local politicians or people representing the tourism industry in Gothenburg, and reportages were written by journalists who have interviewed people representing the tourism industry. By using these articles as sources of information about the tourism industry in Gothenburg I get a fairly current view on it. This is needed since I assume the tourism industry is changing along with tourism and the economy. Of course it would have been preferable if I could have interviewed these representatives myself, but there was no time for that, considering the presentation of the tourism industry is a relatively small part of this paper.

On one occasion in this paper I have used an online based dictionary (Merriam-Webster 2016). The dictionary is created by Merriam-Webster, Incorporated, which is an established company in the business of publishing reference books. In this paper the source is used to support one of my definitions in chapter 2.3.

4 The interviews

Here follows a summary of the interviews made at the hostel Slottsskogens vandrarhem.

4.1 Who are the respondents?

Out of the six respondents five say they live in the southern half of Sweden. The sixth is from and currently lives in Turkey. Four of them have visited Gothenburg before for different reasons. One lived in the city for a couple of years. Two respondents visit because of work; one commutes to the city several times a week and the other does journalistic writing about Gothenburg International Film Festival every year. Three of the other respondents came to Gothenburg to visit a person; in one case a person living in Gothenburg and in two cases to visit each other (they came from different cities to meet in Gothenburg) as well as take part in the film festival. The respondent from Turkey visits Gothenburg because of thoughts about moving there. At the time of the interview none of the respondents have spent more than two weeks in Gothenburg during this particular stay.

4.2 What is – and what is not – a tourist?

Neither of the respondents categorise themselves as a tourist. Instead they say they are either a visitor (four respondents) or a work traveller (two respondents). Three of the Swedish respondents, who also classify themselves as visitors, state that you cannot be a tourist in your own country – at least not if you are in a city. Ski resorts and other outdoor activity areas, however, are different. "Possibly if you were going to Lapland, or something like that, where you have never been before. […] But to go to another Swedish city, then I feel, then I think the tourist concept feels a little … yes"[2] (my transl.), one respondent says. The two Swedish work travellers, on the other hand, think that you *can* be a tourist in a city in your own country. But when you visit a city to work, of course you are not a tourist, they add.

     Furthermore, when it comes to defining what a tourist is, and what differentiates a tourist from visitors and business travellers, the respondents often have some trouble making a clear statement. If you visit someone in the city, whether the person lives there or not, you are more a visitor than a tourist, one Swedish visitor claims. A tourist is more lost in the city. Two Swedish visitors discuss whether the purpose of a visit is a deciding factor. That a visitor has a clear purpose, and a tourist does not. A tourist is more open and wants to get to know the city. But that is not always the case, they admit. Instead they start talking about tourists being

---

[2] "Möjligen om man skulle åka till typ Lappland eller sådär, där man aldrig har varit. […] Men att åka till en annan svensk stad då känner jag, då tycker jag turistbegreppet känns lite … ja."

excluded from the city. One is not a part of what one is visiting if one is a tourist. Another Swedish visitor talks about the difference being whether one is lost and confused (then one is a tourist) or just relaxed (visitor). "Which tram should I take, that is the only question I have"[3] (my transl.), the respondent says about being a visitor in Gothenburg. A tourist, on the other hand, "then you should carry a map and a foreign language and, that is, tourist for me is another country, not another municipality" [4] (my transl.).

The international (Turkish) respondent also self-describes as a visitor, who wants to study the city in order to evaluate whether to move there or not. A tourist, on the other hand, wants to see the main attractions of the city, and to have fun with friends and family. "They want to … eh, broaden their perspective. They want to, you know eh, meet other cultures, know how to they are living, they are getting by every day in life, and learn something new", the respondent says. One of the Swedish work travellers also thinks that a tourist is someone who wants to see the main attractions of the city, like the amusement park Liseberg in Gothenburg. But that does not have to be the case. A tourist can also come to a city and just walk the streets, the respondent says. The second work traveller from Sweden decides that a tourist is someone curious to see the city. The respondent, on the other hand, basically just sees what is relevant for working purposes. But a tourist could also visit just to see a specific event or attraction, without exploring the city. The respondent cannot come up with a general definition for what a tourist is.

4.3 Are tourists good or bad?

All of the respondents agree that tourism is good for a city. Tourists in a city means that it is a safe place, and it is also good for the economy. "All of them [cities] want tourism. It's as simple as that"[5] (my transl.), a work traveller says. That is why attractions are built, to get tourists to visit, the respondent continues. Another respondent says that tourism is a sign of a city that is attractive, and that tourism is connected to general well-being in a country. If a city has few tourists it is often related to high crime rates, the respondent thinks.

When it comes to being a visitor oneself, one Swedish visitor says one has to watch valuables and be wary all the time. This uncomfortable feeling is shared by another Swedish visitor. "Tourist is also a tough thing to be, so you would rather say you are not"[6] (my transl.),

---

[3] "Vilken spårvagn ska jag ta, det är enda frågan jag har."
[4] "Då ska man ha med sig karta och ett främmande språk och, det är, turist för mig det är annat land, inte annan kommun."
[5] "Alla vill ha turism. Så enkelt är det bara."
[6] "Turist är också en jobbig grej och va, så det vill man ju helst inte säga att man är."

the respondent says. However, other respondents underline the welcoming attitudes one can be met with from residents in the city when one is a tourist. "People can be friendly if one introduces oneself as a tourist. Tell about their places, and things like that"[7] (my transl.), one respondent says. The international visitor talks about a vibe that makes one feel welcome in Gothenburg. This respondent enjoys being a tourist because of this, and because of liking to visit new places.

Furthermore, the respondents talk about how they feel toward other tourists. One Swedish visitor would rather not be near tourists, and the same goes for one of the work travellers, who says the reason is a bad feeling when being in big crowds, which one often sees tourists move around in. This respondent also talks about the difference between big and small cities being visited by tourists. The respondents explains:

> Well, I can imagine that it's, it concerns the big city dweller less, the tourists blend into the crowd more than they do on… on, for example, in for instance Borgholm on Öland, which is totally transformed, that doesn't happen here. And there are people who don't like that. But there are also many who realise that it is necessary if they are to be able to continue living there at all.[8] (my transl.)

Another respondent gives witness about "tourist" being used as a word of abuse in smaller cities, where a lot of tourists from bigger cities appear for a few weeks and perhaps behave in an inappropriate way. "When the people from Stockholm came during week 9 and took over Åre and screamed and talked and …"[9] (my transl.), the respondent pictures it. Otherwise the respondent thinks, as indeed most of the respondents do, that it is nice to see tourists.

---

[7] "Människor kan ju vara vänliga mot en om man presenterar sig som en turist. Tipsa om sina ställen och såna saker."

[8] "Ja, jag kan ju tänka mig att det är, det berör storstadsbon mindre, turisterna försvinner mer i mängden, än vad dom gör på … på till exempel, i till exempel Borgholm på Öland, som blir fullkomligt förvandlat, det händer ju inte här. Och det finns ju folk som inte gillar det, alltså. Men också många som inser att det är nödvändigt för att dom ska kunna bo kvar överhuvudtaget."

[9] "När stockholmarna kom vecka 9 och tog över hela Åre och skrek och pratade och …"

5 How and why the respondents categorise themselves

Compiling and analysing the answers of the six respondents in this study, it is possible to make some clear observations. Clearest of them all might be that, even though all my respondents were staying at a hostel near the city centre of Gothenburg, no one claimed to be a tourist. Also, it is clear that the limited amount of respondents and the fact that the study was conducted outside of tourist season likely had some effect on my results; during tourist season and with more respondents I would probably have found some self-described tourists. However, what conclusions can actually be drawn from this material? Might there be some tourists among my respondents after all, even though they would not call themselves so?

5.1 Within the group of respondents – what conclusions can be drawn?

None of the respondents would categorise themselves as tourists. However, some of them would say a few of my respondents actually are tourists. Three respondents who were self-categorised as visitors said, in more or less clear terms, that one is a tourist when one is abroad. This would without doubt make the respondent from Turkey a tourist. The respondents who categorised themselves as work travellers, on the other hand, say that one *can* be a tourist in one's own country, and that a tourist in Gothenburg can be someone who visits a certain event or just walks the streets. According to this definition the three Swedish visitors are tourists as well.

A common statement from the respondents is that a tourist desires to see the main attractions of the city, like the amusement park Liseberg in Gothenburg. Some also say that a tourist is lost and new to the city, without a clear goal. Neither of these characteristics apply to the respondents. However, this is a definition that all of the respondents agree on, since they mention one or several aspects of it, and neither of them oppose it with another characteristic. This means that the definition of a tourist, according to the compiled descriptions of all the respondents, is *someone new and lost in the city, without a clear goal, who wants to visit the main attractions*.

Tourism is good for a city, according to all respondents. If there are tourists, it means the city is safe and attractive with a high quality of life. One respondent claims that tourists are the reason why attractions and arenas are built. Most of the respondents also feel good being tourists, because of all the friendliness and welcoming one receives from city residents. However, a few respondents feel unsafe as tourists. The respondents also differ in whether they enjoy meeting other tourists or not. One respondent claims that this attitude often depend

on whether one lives in a small or a big city, since tourists make a much bigger impact during a more limited season in smaller cities or villages.

This is what can be underlined and concluded when looking exclusively at the data from the interviews. Now the theories will be applied in order to analyse what thoughts and motivations, conscious or subconscious, might be behind the respondents' answers.

5.2 How did the respondents think?

According to the social identity theory and Henri Tajfel, the respondents seek to create a satisfactory image of themselves when categorising. This in comparison with people around them, such as other guests at the hostel or the staff. Whichever category the respondents chose (visitor or work traveller), they considered it more compatible with their beliefs and intentions than any other category close to hand (Tajfel 2010:79f). But was tourist something they considered and dismissed? Since the respondents knew that the study is about urban tourism and were asked other questions specifically about tourists, they all must have, to some degree, thought about whether they were tourists or not. Another fact is that some respondents categorised other respondents (the visitors) as tourists, meaning these respondents must also have considered "tourist" a categorisation they could have assumed. This indicates that, at least in some cases, tourist was a category the visitors considered similar to the one they actually chose. In other words, they preferred being visitors and *therefore chose not to be tourists*.

On the basis of this assumption, the emotional significance connected to being a visitor must have been more positive than being a tourist (Tajfel 2010:80). This is partly confirmed by some respondents' negative feelings toward being near tourists and being tourists themselves. However, with other respondents' feelings it is the other way around. Could it be that both positive and negative feelings are connected with tourists, but different respondents choose to embrace one or the other? Moreover, the fact is that none of the respondents chose to self-describe as a tourist, and this supports the assumption that being a tourist *in the particular situation that the respondents were in when being interviewed* is connected to negative emotional significance (at least for a few of them), and therefore categorising as a tourist would have had a negative effect on the respondents' social identity (Tajfel 2010:80).

In order to dissociate from an unwanted connection a person can create or enhance differences between groups (Tajfel 2010:84f), and if the distinction is made clear the person can have a tendency to dislike members of the other group (Tajfel 2010:78). This might be the case for a few of the categorised visitors in my study. The assumption is based on the many

different explanations of why the respondents are not tourists. For instance, three of the visitors claimed that a tourist has to be abroad, but this was not mentioned by the work travellers. The explanations were different depending on the categorisation of the respondents, which leads to the assumption that differentiations between tourists and the chosen social group might have been created or enhanced, according to the model by Tajfel. In one case the distinction might even be strong enough for the respondent to dislike tourists.

Another aspect in categorising is the goal. This was discussed by a few respondents, and the spontaneous conclusion was that a visitor has a clear goal in the city, while the tourist does not. This is compatible with Sciaraffa's claim that every social role has a goal (Sciaraffa 2009:109). In order to identify with the role of a tourist, one has to identify with what one assumes to be the comprehensive goal of that social role (Sciaraffa 2009:111f). When the respondents do not identify as a tourist, they reject the goal of that social role, or they find another goal connected to another role more meaningful (Sciaraffa 2009:114f). This would mean that the goal of a work traveller or a visitor is more compatible with who the respondents want to be. If the goal of the tourist is to, without any particular plan, experience the main attractions of the city, it is simply not what the respondents wanted out of their stay.

5.3 Do tourists have symbolic capital?

Symbolic capital can be thought of as a sort of status, which may have affected the respondents' categorisation, depending on whether tourists have symbolic capital or not. And with symbolic capital comes social power, Bourdieu claims. A person can receive symbolic capital through other people's valuing of his or her characteristics or types of capital (cultural, economic etc.). In one context one has symbolic capital, while in another one does not, since different people value different things (Bourdieu 1999:97). Do tourists in Gothenburg thus have symbolic capital, and thereby social power and presumably high status?

According to the respondents the characteristics of a tourist is being new to the city, not knowing too much, and being interested in the main attractions. All respondents think that tourists are good for a city, which means that tourists are appreciated and thereby have symbolic capital. However, being a tourist or being among tourists make some respondents feel uncomfortable. We also have the fact that neither of the respondents who were borderline to being a tourist chose to identify as one. So they appreciate what tourists do, but they do not want to be one themselves, on this particular occasion. Why is that? The answer might be that tourists have symbolic capital and social power, but they are also socially exposed and more or less dependent on people around them. On the basis of this assumption, being a tourist is

like having an important and appreciated job, but it is also a job that no one wants to have in a hostel in Gothenburg during wintertime.

Bourdieu also says, just like Tajfel, that people have a tendency to create differences between what is actually similar. This is because distinction only exists in relation to other characteristics (Bourdieu 1999:15f). Based on this theoretical principal, one can assume that some respondents create differences between themselves and tourists only when they are in relation to a tourist, and also make the choice not to be a tourist. Such a situation might appear when I, by posing questions, force the respondents to decide whether they are tourists or not. If they are not forced to relate to a tourist, they might not identify the same differences between tourists and themselves (visitors and work travellers) as they do in this study. When identifying differences, the respondents analyse their own and tourists' practices and choose the differences from there (Bourdieu 1999:19). The differences between the work travellers' practices and tourists' practices are obvious (one is a tourist on one's leisure time, and the work travellers are there for work), and therefore they give a broader definition of a tourist than the visitors do. This while, in some cases, the visitors and tourists are borderline to each other.

5.4 A cultural high or low?

When translating tourism to the theories about high and low culture, we see the role of a tourist as a cultural phenomenon, according to my motivation in chapter 2.3.2 above. Now we have to decide whether tourism is a high or a low cultural phenomenon, in order to decide what status a tourist has among the respondents. The conclusion drawn can then be added to the equation of why none of the respondents elected to categorise themselves as a tourist, in spite of my previous assumptions showing that it would have been fully reasonable for some of them to do so.

Mikita Brottman defines low culture as something that many people consume (Brottman 2005:XXIIf), and the same is true for T.S. Eliot, as he says the lower levels of culture have more practitioners (Eliot 1962:37). Translated from culture to tourism this would mean that many people *are* tourists. Looking straightforwardly at the results of this study that would not be the case, since none of my respondents claimed to be tourists, and my previous analysis would not force most of them to be tourists either. However, looking at what the respondents are saying, the conclusion might be different. In some ways the respondents expressed that many people actually are tourists. For example, many of the respondents talked about when they themselves are tourists at other occasions. One talked about tourists often forming

crowds of people and visiting all at once during tourist season. This indicates that either many people are tourists (at least during certain periods of time), or that it is commonly assumed that that is the case.

Eliot also says that the lower culture is less conscious than the higher (Eliot 1962:37f). Is this confirmed by my results? Tourists are described as being lost and without a clear goal, relying on residents and the tourism industry to show them the main attractions. Also, one is a tourist during one's leisure time, when one can assume that most people prefer to relax their thoughts. On the basis of these assumptions tourism would not be a very conscious kind of activity, and therefore a low form of culture. However, note that this is not supported by my results.

Just like Bourdieu, Eliot mentions power levels. The big groups on lower levels have the same power as small groups on high levels (Eliot 1962:48). This idea of power connected to tourism confirms our assumption that tourists have symbolic capital and social power. This power might partly depend on tourism being connected to economic wealth and high consumption, which is expressed by the respondents. An economic connection which further confirms tourism's position as a low culture, based on the general claim that low culture is produced to make a profit (Bru & van Nujis 2012:3-10). The producers in this case must be the city, which makes a profit on the consumption made by the tourists.

Do all tourists thereby end up on the lower end of the cultural scale? Perhaps not. After all, there are different kinds of tourists, also within the definition offered by the respondents. However, the interesting thing here is how tourists are thought of by the respondents, and not what might actually be the case. Instead, the *objective* reality of tourists has been treated by previous research, and in the following chapter their results will be compared with the conclusions made above.

6 In relation to the background

Previous research on urban tourism has been based mostly on statistics from the tourism industry and quantitative studies (Page 1995:58). This research constitutes the background of my study, and my results are to be compared with conclusions from other researchers. However, in order for my results to be comparable with previous research, I must ensure that the environment for my study, Gothenburg, fits into the mould of what other researchers describe as the place where they found their results. Therefore I will first compare the facts on the Gothenburg tourism industry with previous research.

6.1 A city valid for comparison?

A city that is highly comparable with Gothenburg is Stockholm, since they are the two biggest cities in Sweden. Since the 1980s, Stockholm has been aiming their marketing toward business travellers as well as leisure tourists (Ågren 2013:31f). This is also what Gothenburg is doing, which is proven by Camilla Nyman talking about the three legs; "meeting city, event city and tourist city" (Hugo 2014). This would mean that events and meeting activities, such as festivals and conferences, are also part of the tourism industry in Gothenburg. Smith talks about events being a way for industrial cities to compete for the visitors with a historic city like Stockholm (Smith 2013:85ff). He also says that events can be used to attract visitors even after the competition or concert is completed, since marketing the events also indirectly markets the city (Smith 2013:97f). The conclusions of this theory are widely used by Göteborg & Co, which shows when Nyman talks about the events as being an important tool to attract attention from other cities (Hugo 2014). Bigger events, like Gothenburg's 4th centennial, are also used as a way to improve the city for residents as well as tourists (Söndergaard 2011), which is also something Smith recognises as a good way of using events (Smith 2013:87).

A lot of what Göteborg & Co puts forth as part of their strategy is supported by previous research, which indicates that Gothenburg is a suitable city for application of the previous research.

6.2 Confirmed or not confirmed?

A definition of what an urban tourist in general is was made by Myriam Jansen-Verbeke. According to this definition, a tourist is someone coming from outside the city centre and visiting the city centre mainly for leisure purposes (Jansen-Verbeke 1986:83f). Based on my results and representing the respondents, a new definition of the urban tourist is presented in

chapter 5.1: someone new and lost in the city, without a clear goal, who wants to visit the main attractions. Comparing this with the definition by Jansen-Verbeke, there are few similarities. Jansen-Verbeke includes anyone who travels to the city centre outside of working hours, as long as he or she does not live there from the start. It does not matter how many times the person has been there before, whether or not he or she is lost, or what sort of activities the person is seeking – all of which are variables in the respondents' definition. The conclusion therefore becomes that *the definition of an urban tourist made by the respondents in this study is clearly different from what researchers, or at least one of them, categorise as a tourist*.

Furthermore, how would the different respondents in this study be categorised, if the previous research was to decide? Here Maitland's dividing of tourists into different groups can be used. The most obvious categorisation is business traveller, who is someone visiting because of work, which would fit on the respondents categorised as work travellers by themselves. Maitland also mentions visitors of friends and family, which would apply to the respondent visiting someone living in the city. However, Maitland's definition of a visitor would not include the remaining respondents who categorised themselves as visitors, since neither of them is visiting a person living in the city. What would he say they are instead?

Maitland talks about post-tourists as people who avoid the traditional tourist areas to find what is authentic for the city (Maitland 2006:25f). This applies to the respondent from Turkey, since the purpose of this respondent's visit was to get to know the city and investigate everyday life-necessities, in order to decide whether he or she wanted to move there or not. The other two respondents came to Gothenburg to visit the film festival. Maitland does not say anything specific about post-tourists visiting events. This leaves us with the last type of tourists: mass tourists. According to Maitland they can be found in the tourist areas of the city and they make use of what the tourism industry offers. Festivals or events are not mentioned by Maitland here either (Maitland 2006:26f). However, events are part of Göteborg & Co's marketing strategy, and therefore a product of the tourism industry, more or less. This would put the respondents visiting the film festival close to being mass tourists, but the conclusion is not indisputable.

Maitland's definition of a mass tourist would thus be close to the general definition of an urban tourist made by the respondents. They both focus on tourists being interested in the main attractions (that presumably are to be found in the tourist areas). The definition made by the respondents also include being new to the city and lost, but these variables do not oppose

Maitland's definition. It can therefore be stated that *the respondents' definition of a tourist is more or less the same as the mass tourist described by Maitland*.

6.3 Who is adapting to changing tourism?

The researchers talk about an urban tourism that is changing (Jansen-Verbeke 1986:80ff; Maitland 2006:25f; Ågren 2013:247f). Interaction through the internet is becoming increasingly prevalent, and this also affects urban tourism. Kim and Tussyadiah talks about tourists nowadays using social networks as support while visiting cities, instead of relying solely on the information produced by the tourism industry (Kim & Tussyadiah 2013:80f). Tourists and residents are more alike, since they have more access to each other. This new way of being a tourist is confirmed by the SAS campaign "We are travelers", which is indicating that travelling people feel at home in more than one city, know how to find places and do not need "guidebooks" to move around (SAS 2016). *The new way of being a tourist is to explore the city as a familiar place, rather than as something unknown*. And this reality could probably not exist without the internet and social networks, which allow people from all over the world who do not know each other to communicate. This would thus mean that the SAS campaign is including more people than what was originally intended. Not just the frequent travellers, but also travellers who use social networks to get to know the city before arrival.

However, this new and more "daring" tourism, contrasting the established mass tourism, is not called tourism at all by the respondents in this study. While researchers and the tourism industry seem to broaden the concept of tourism, by creating new subcategories and include these in the industry's target group, actual people do not appear to have embraced this change. They stick to the traditional definition of a tourist, which researchers now call mass tourists, and instead choose the word "visitor" when they are forced to categorise someone (themselves) who is neither a business nor a work traveller, and not a tourist according to their own definition. Will people in general eventually embrace researchers' and the industry's new concept of a tourist, or will it be the other way around?

7 Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine how a limited group of non-residents in Gothenburg categorise themselves and why, relating to the concept of being a tourist. The questions I posed to the material following the purpose was about how many of the respondents categorised themselves as tourists, and whether tourist was a possible categorisation for those who did not. I also sought to ascertain what status tourists have among the respondents and whether that status had any effect on their categorisation, as well as how their perception and definition of a tourist apply to previous research and the tourism industry.

The data were collected from interviews with six respondents, made in January and February at a hostel in the part of Gothenburg called Olivedal. The results of the interviews show that none of the respondents categorised themselves as tourists, more or less according to the respondents' compiled definition of a tourist: someone new and lost in the city, without a clear goal, who wants to visit the main attractions.

Analysing the results through social identity theory and a philosophical perspective on role identification shows that not being a tourist probably was a choice by some of the respondents. This was based on the fact that the respondents undoubtedly considered whether they were tourists or not, and that some respondents gave definitions that would categorize other respondents as tourists. According to social identity theory this would mean that the respondents who could have been categorised as tourists, but chose not to, found it would have a negative effect on their social identity in the particular situation they were in during the interview. Also, the respondents did not find the presumed goal for the role of a tourist compatible with their own comprehensive goal and their idea of what they would like to be.

Furthermore, analysing the respondents' opinions of being a tourist at other occasions, as well as about tourists in general, Bourdieu's theory on symbolic capital tells us that tourists as a group have social power. This is based on the respondents thinking that tourists are good for a city, and thereby ascribing tourists authority and symbolic capital, which means they also have social power. However, despite the social power, none of the respondents categorised themselves as tourists while being interviewed. For some of the respondents, saying they were tourists would have been impossible if they were to follow the compiled definition above, but for others it would have been reasonable. Though instead of being tourists the results indicate that some of these respondents enhanced or created differences between themselves and tourists. This is in line with Bourdieu's and Tajfel's theoretical claim that people have a tendency to create differences between what is actually similar.

Why did some of the respondents do this, considering they also ascribed tourists social power? Could a powerful social role still be something that people do not want to be in some occasions? If one values whether being a tourist is high or low on the cultural scale, the answer to that question is yes. According to the criteria by Brottman, Eliot, Bru and van Nujis, about low culture being practiced by many, being a less conscious activity, having the power of a big group and being connected to big money, tourism is low culture. Therefore being a tourist means to have low status, even though tourists can still be appreciated by people in general.

Furthermore, looking at the results against the background of previous research and the tourism industry in Gothenburg, the conclusions can be viewed from a broader perspective. The research corresponds to the tourism industry's (here in the shape of Göteborg & Co) modus operandi, which indicates that they have the same idea of what a tourist is. This idea is far broader than the one proposed by the respondents, including people who do not look for the main attractions and not considering whether a person is experienced in a city or not. This means that, according to the definitions proposed by previous research, three of the respondents are categorised as either post-tourists or mass tourists. Looking at the compiled definition offered by the respondents, it is virtually the same as what the research defines as a mass tourist. This is also the more established kind of tourist which existed before the change in tourism about which the researchers are talking and to which the tourism industry has adapted its activities. All of this indicates that the respondents have not been aware of this change and still validate the traditional definition of a tourist.

This conclusion means that it is not *all* tourists (according to the research definition) the respondents do not want to be. Instead it is being a mass tourist which is low culture and low status, even though that group has social power. The goal of a mass tourist was incompatible with the goals of the respondents. This together with the low status of being a mass tourist at that particular time made the respondents self-categorise as visitors instead.

7.1 In short

Here the purpose and research questions of this study will be answered shortly:

- Answering how the respondents categorised themselves, the results show that two respondents chose work traveller and four chose visitor. Why they did not categorise themselves as tourists, in the cases when it would have been reasonable to do so, cannot be fully answered by this material. However the theories lead to assumptions

about whether it might be because of the social status of tourists or the fact that the respondents' presumed goal of a tourist was incompatible with their own.

- The first research question is thus answered with the fact that none of the respondents categorised themselves as tourists.

- Analysing the material through the theories shows that tourist must have been a possible choice for at least some of the respondents.

- The results show that tourists in general have low status among the respondents, since tourism is a low type of culture. However, tourists are also appreciated and considered important, giving them social power. This equivocal result might explain why the respondents did not want to be tourists at the time of the interview, but did not hesitate to say that they were tourists at other occasions.

- The respondents' perception of a tourist is considerably narrower than the one presented by previous research and the local tourism industry. The compiled definition provided by the respondents is more or less equivalent with what Maitland categorises as a mass tourist. Previous research and the tourism industry also include event visitors and people with no connection to city residents in their perception of a tourist, which would make some of the respondents tourists after all.

7.2 The bigger picture

This study was based on results from a very limited group of respondents during a limited period of time, which means it can only give indications on what is actually valid in the bigger picture; among visitors staying at other hostels, in other cities, during other parts of the year and among people in general. However, this limited group of respondents provided deeper information on their opinions than a wider survey could have done. The indications are rich in detail, which gives this study conclusions on several different levels based on this particular group of respondents. If we thus are to follow the indications provided by these conclusions, what do we get?

Regarding the word "tourist", the difference between the opinion of professionals within tourism and people in general is palpable. The professionals have consciously followed the change in tourism, while the tourists have not. Instead, they have other concepts for what the professionals call "post-tourists". Can this be a problem? Perhaps. If the tourism industry and the researchers are aware of the difference they can adjust to it. The researchers can get better results if they understand what respondents mean by choosing certain words. The industry can also adjust its communication toward the customers to what people in general consider being

a tourist. If the industry is not aware of it, the gap between the perceptions of them and their customers might get bigger, and the communication between the two parties might occasionally miss the mark. This could lead to a loss of customers for the industry as well as lost opportunities for the tourists.

However, these problems only apply for tourists actually using the tourism industry as a source of information. The group not doing so appears to get bigger and bigger. Instead they rely on other people, with whom they communicate through social networks on the internet. Then tourists can get information about activities outside the traditional tourist areas, which also means outside the area controlled by the tourism industry, and when they do that, the differences in activities between residents and tourists will grow smaller. The tourists can experience several cities as home, find the key to hidden places and burn their guidebooks, just like the SAS campaign states.

7.3 Further research

This relatively small study makes room for further research on the subject of urban tourism through the perspective of tourists and other non-residents. The same study could be made on a bigger scale, with more respondents and preferably during tourist season, in order to verify or deny the indications I present on the basis of my conclusions. Other angles that would be interesting to confront my purpose with is the perspective of residents in Gothenburg or people working for the tourism industry close to the customers, such as staff at the amusement park Liseberg. Of course, the subject of social networks used by tourists is also fit for future research, not least because of the part these networks play in my conclusions and further indications.

8 References

The sources used in this paper consist of literature (books and articles), daily newspaper articles, dictionary articles and pictures.

8.1 Literature

Bourdieu, Pierre (1999). *Praktiskt förnuft: bidrag till en handlingsteori*. Göteborg: Daidalos.

Brottman, Mikita (2005). *High theory / low culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bru, Sascha & van Nujis, Laurence (2012). "Given the popular". In Bru, Sascha (edit.). *Regarding the popular: modernism, the avant-garde, and high and low culture*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Eliot, Thomas Stearns (1962). *Notes towards the Definition of Culture*. [New ed.] London: Faber.

Holmkvist, Leif (2010). "Avspark i Göteborg: Sabine Söndergaard leder matchen om eventen och turismen". *Resumé*. 40 vol. 2010. Stockholm: Bonnier Tidskrifter.

Jansen-Verbeke, Myriam (1986). "Inner-city tourism: Resources, tourists and promoters". *Annals of Tourism Research*. 13 vol. 1 publ. 1986. Amsterdam: Elsevier Limited.

Kim, Jeongmi & Tussyadiah, Iis P. (2013). "Social Networking and Social Support in Tourism Experience: The Moderating Role of Online Self-Presentation Strategies". *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*. 30 vol. 1-2 issue. 2013. London: Routledge.

Maitland, Robert (2006). "Culture, City Users and the Creation of New Tourism Areas in Cities". In Smith, Melanie K. (edit.). *Tourism, culture, and regeneration.* Wallingford, UK: CABI Pub.

Page, Stephen (1995). *Urban tourism*. London: Routledge.

Postmes, Tom & Branscombe, Nyla R. (2010). *Rediscovering Social Identity: Key readings*. New York: Psychology Press.

Sciaraffa, Stefan (2009). "Identification, Meaning, and the Normativity of Social Roles". *European Journal of Philosophy*. 19 vol. 1 issue. 2011. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Smith, Andrew (2006). "After the circus leaves town: the relationship between sport events, tourism and urban regeneration". In Smith, Melanie K. (edit.). *Tourism, culture, and regeneration.* Wallingford, UK: CABI Pub.

Tajfel, Henri (2010). "Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour". In Postmes, Tom & Branscombe, Nyla R. (edit.). *Rediscovering Social Identity: Key readings*. New York: Psychology Press.

Thambert, Fredrik (2016). "Skapade SAS reklamkoncept – nu lämnar han flygbolaget". *Resumé*. www.resume.se. Published 2016-01-24. Viewed 2016-03-03.

Turner, John C. & Reynolds, Katherine J. (2010). "The Story of Social Identity". In Postmes, Tom & Branscombe, Nyla R. (edit.). *Rediscovering Social Identity: Key readings*. New York: Psychology Press.

Ågren, Karin (2013). *Att sälja en stad: Stockholms besöksnäring 1936-2011*. Stockholm: Stockholmia.

8.2 Newspaper articles

Engström, Johan; Hansson, Henrik; Ossiansson, Eva (2010). "Grå bild av Västsverige för potentiella turister". *Göteborgs-Posten*. 2010-07-29.

Gadd, Stefan (2010). "18 raka år av ökad turism i Göteborg". *Göteborgs-Posten*. 2010-08-01.

Hugo, Linus (2014). "Ibland är vi faktiskt mycket bättre än vad vi tror". *Göteborgs-Posten*. 2014-06-07.

Söndergaard, Sabine (2011). "Så ska turismen i Göteborg växa". *Göteborgs-Posten*. 2011-03-24.

8.3 Dictionary articles

"tourist" (2015). *Merriam-Webster*. www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tourist. Viewed 2016-02-22.

8.4 Pictures

SAS (Scandinavian Airlines) (2016).
- Picture 1 [commercial poser]. www.sas.se/media/webcasts. Viewed 2016-02-26 (the picture has now been removed from this website, view appendix for current URL).
- Picture 2 [commercial poster]. www.sas.se/media/webcasts. Viewed 2016-02-26 (the picture has now been removed from this website, view appendix for current URL).
- Picture 3 [commercial poster]. www.sixmoment.com/wearetravelers. Viewed 2016-02-26 (the picture has now been removed from this website, view appendix for current URL).

Appendix

Pictures presenting the SAS advertising posters

This picture has been removed for copyright reasons. It can be found through this link: https://scontent.cdninstagram.com/t51.2885-15/s640x640/sh0.08/e35/12479492_1691447494447089_265715864_n.jpg.

Picture 1: SAS 2016.

This picture has been removed for copyright reasons. It can be found through this link: https://scontent.cdninstagram.com/t51.2885-15/s480x480/e35/12552454_488676531335852_155866179_n.jpg.

Picture 2: SAS 2016.

This picture has been removed for copyright reasons. It can be found through this link: https://scontent.cdninstagram.com/hphotos-xft1/t51.2885-15/s320x320/e35/12354077_940043852740923_1131532372_n.jpg.

Picture 3: SAS 2016.