

Sociology of Tourism: Shifting Paradigm from Nostalgia to Happiness

Ramji Sharma

Visiting Faculty, Janapriya Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University, Pokhara, Nepal
ramjisharma@gmail.com

Article History

Received 1 April 2020
Accepted 12 April 2020

Keywords

Sociology of tourism, nostalgia, hedonic and eudaemonic, sustainable tourism, stakeholders' happiness

Abstract

Travel is not a recent genre. However, the concept of modern tourism is a naïve charm. Due to its outrageous rumble worldwide, it has now become the biggest industry of 21st century. With the growth, tourism has gradually been creating its own space in academia. Sociologists also could not remain oblivious to tourism's multifaceted implications on individual, society and culture. Boorstin endeavored to pull tourism in sociological domain since 1962 but could create its own niche in Sociology in 70s specifically with the advent of prominent scholars like Dean MacCannell and John Urry in this premise. Tourism now has become an appealing proposition in sociology though it's theoretical gravity and methodological progression is still in embryonic stage. The objective of this paper is to review and synthesize the cognition of tourism in sociological domain from escapism (nostalgia) disposition to the current trend of happiness premise.

Background

Travel in many cases is considered as an individual activity associated with leisure and recreation. Travel, per se,

Corresponding Editor
Ramesh Raj Kunwar
kunwar.dr@gmail.com

is an ancient genre. There were varieties of reasons for travel then. Whatsoever, travel for quest and knowledge was just an affair of elites and aristocrats. In recent years, the concept of travel and tourism has been gradually stretching out from the level of an individual activity to that of social phenomenon. Travel also lost its aristocratic character in 19th century and became synonymous with compliance to mass patterns of destination consumption of bourgeois experience thereby transmuting ancient traveler into a modern tourist (Medeiros, 2017). Tourism at present has a range of typologies and facets with multifarious implications. The modern pattern of travel and tourism is merely the derivative of 21st century and its socio-cultural implications are relatively in masked fashion or sometimes in bamboozled attire. As per Smith (1989), tourism is the social interaction between tourists as 'guests' and residents in the tourist destination as 'hosts'. It is obvious that host-guest interactions and interfaces are inevitable corollaries in tourism industry and the significant progeny is that the cultural parcel of tourist is invisible but bigger than the visible baggage. Leiper (1979) has depicted tourism still further presenting a social system model of hosts, guests and intermediaries characterized by three constituents: "tourist source region, tourism industry and destination". Whatsoever, traveling to a strange community or destination induces a kind of emotion to the visitors. It also sensitizes the people in the destination community in varieties of ways. Some are manifested in lifestyle, dress code, food habit, pollution and many other social, cultural, economic as well as environmental tenets where as some impacts and implications on values, norms, behavior, traditions, attitudes, beliefs, morals and social structure (VNBT-ABMS) are rather latent but do grow perniciously like a husk fire threatening the destination's existing brand image, originality and identity.

From other perspective, travelers in a strange location also find an unfamiliar set up not only geographically but personally, socially, culturally as well as environmentally. Goeldner and Ritchie (2012) articulate in this connection that visitors must manage their social interactions and social relations in the strange destination to obtain sustenance, shelter, and other needs and possibly to find companionship as well. People who travel do so with different degrees of contact with the new cultures in which they find themselves. There are reciprocal attempts from host community as well whether the attempts are for personal gain or psychological satisfaction or professional advantage or economic prosperity. In this context, traveling comprises a process of socio-cultural adjustments and exchanges for both guests and hosts. Blau (1964, p. 89) regards social life of exchange as a 'market place' in which actors negotiate with each other in order to make a gain – a material benefit or a psychological reward. Hosts and guests both expect something of benefit in a destination and exchange something of value that might be tangible, mixed or entirely intangible.

In Abhram's (2011) notion, the theory of social exchange is not one coherent theoretical system, rather it is a mixture of utilitarian economics, functional anthropology and behavioral psychology that embraces British individualistic as well as French collectivistic orientations. Abhram gives credit to George Homans and Peter Blau for the contemporary variations of social exchange theory. Nonetheless, the classical traditions of the exchange theory are attributed to James Frazer, Malinowski, Marcel Mauss and Levi-Strauss. It seems that James Frazer explicitly formulated the exchange theory for the first time through the study of various kinship, marriage practices and preferences of the Australian aboriginals for cross-cousin marriage and their prohibition of parallel cousin marriages. However, the clear distinction between economic exchange and social exchange was drawn by Malinowski for the first time in his ethnography of the *Trobriand Islander* where he discussed an exchange system called the *Kula Ring* (exchange of armlets and necklaces) which travelled in opposite directions within a closed circle of individuals (Abraham, 2011, p. 145). Marcel Mauss reinterpreted the *Kula Ring* of Malinowski and reacted over the Malinowski's notion as that every social exchange transaction creates social bonds that not only tie one person to another and to society but one segment of society to another (Ekeh, 1974, p. 32). In connection to exchange hypothesis, Nunez (1963) portrayed tourism from the perspective of acculturation whereas Cohen (1974) views tourism as a peculiar industry that commodifies certain relationships such as hospitality. Cohen also inaugurated a debate of cultural authenticity in tourism. On the other hand, Furham (1984) characterized the differences and difficulties of host-guest cultures as 'cultural shock'. Uriely's (1997) *real* and *hyper-real* concept has instituted the notion of postmodernity in tourism. Thus tourism implication, though seems individual, is not limited to hosts and guests only but appears to the entire destination in a gradual pace eventually intruding on the whole gamut of destination's identity, image and appeal.

Objective and methodology

The main objective of this paper is to review and synthesize the cognition of tourism in sociological domain from *nostalgia* (Boorstin, 1964; Davis, 1979; Dann, 1994) disposition to the current trend of *happiness premise* (Sharma, 2018). The study was mostly based on "umbrella review", a compilation technique of all the evidence of existing articles, publications and reviews on relevant topic to give a high level overview (Grant & Booth, 2009) and, therefore, depends on secondary information which is qualitative too. This article, thus, cannot be claimed to be entirely free from subjective preconception, however, it is believed that the derived insight will be an instrumental building block for conceptual as well as theoretical augmentation over the sociological study of tourism. For this paper, more than forty articles and publications on tourism published in international journals, magazines and

periodicals written at least with sociological reflections were considered for review and analysis. Besides, some relevant books, publications and websites on sociology, anthropology and tourism were further supplementary stuffs for this article.

Tourists typology in socio-cultural context

The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) has defined “tourism as an activity of a person travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business or any other purpose”. This definition covers a wide range of travelers as tourists. But sociological investigations and researches on tourism have linked tourists’ typology as social ‘actors’ (Yasumura, 1994). From socio-cultural perspective, tourism can be typified as ‘substantial’ which is based mainly on the social attributes of tourists such as their sex, age, status, desire to travel and so on (Przeclawski, 1993; Smith, 1989; Wahab, 1975) and ‘relational’ which depends upon the socio-cultural context of tourism activities (Cohen, 1972; Smith, 1989).

Cohen (1979) has categorized tourists from sociological perspective into four types on the basis of two extreme poles of ‘strangeness’ and ‘familiarity’ as: drifter, explorer, individual mass tourist, and organized mass tourist. Similarly, Smith (1989) has also proposed a typology of tourists by considering the impacts of tourism on society. She has considered three factors - the number of tourists, their goals, and their adaptation to classify tourists’ typology into seven types which are: explorers, elite tourists, off-beat tourists, unusual tourists, incipient mass tourists, mass tourists, and charter tourists. Cohen and Smith both have connected the tourists’ typology context with social relations and influences over the host community.

Hosts-guests relations in socio-cultural domain

The host-guest relations have been found to be explained in two different perspectives - i.e. static and dynamic - in socio-cultural domain. The static features of hosts and guests relations are found in the works of de Kadt (1979) and UNESCO (1976). de Kadt has presented three situations of interaction between hosts and guests. They are: (1) interchanges involving trade of services and goods, (2) surface interaction and encounters in the places of recreation (such as beaches and bars), and (3) interaction involving mutual-understanding and information exchanges. Similarly, UNESCO’s research shows that the hosts and guests relationship has four features: (1) its transitory nature, (2) temporal and spatial constraints, (3) lack of spontaneity and 4) unequal and unbalanced experience. Such concepts of host-guest relations have been confirmed by subsequent researches conducted by Harrison (1992), Smith (1989) and Urry (1990). Their results suggest that the relation between hosts and tourists is unbalanced and might involve many complex social-cultural phenomena.

Such social-cultural phenomena of interactional processes have been examined through dynamic approach by Doxey (1975) and Butler (1980) which are pioneering studies on the dynamic features of hosts and guests relations. Doxey (1975) proposed the 'irridex' (irritation index) model which indicates four different stages of destination on the basis of host responses: (1) euphoria, (2) apathy, (3) irritation or annoyance, and (5) antagonism. In contrast to the irridex model, Butler's model focused on the complexity of the interactional process and six different stages of destination continuum: (1) exploration, (2) involvement, (3) development, (4) consolidation, (5) stagnation, and (6) decline (Butler, 1980). Butler derived four categories from the intersection of two axes, 'active / passive' and 'positive / negative' mainly based on two determinant factors: social attributes of visitors and the carrying capacity of the local community. They are (1) aggressive promotion and support, (2) slight acceptance and support, (3) silent acceptance but opposition, and (4) aggressive opposition. In destination areas, these four types of hosts' responses might interweave intricately causing much more complex situations to appear.

The works of Doxey and Butler both considered interactions between hosts and guests with unequal benefit specially the destination community as the loser and considered only the responses of the host side. Jafari (2005) has categorized five different stages of tourism development since the advent of mass tourism that he has termed platforms of tourism thought. They were advocacy platform (only positive impacts emphasized), cautionary platform (negative impacts highlighted), adaptancy platform (good and bad stories of tourism identified and suggested for alternatives), knowledge-based platform (a body of knowledge created in academic level) and the public platform (tourism gained visibility in every sphere of public agenda). Macbeth (2005) has added a sixth platform: ethics. Among tourism researchers, Urry (1990) probably is the single person who has taken care of the other side of the coin, i.e. responses from guests' perspective, to study the socio-cultural implications of tourism on tourists.

Sociology of tourism and shifting theoretical paradigm

Sociology is the science of society, social institutions and social relationships (Bottomore, 1986). When travelers interact with the people of new community, the *cultural distance* plays important role and visitors always try to create special relationship with society and social institutions of the visited community. Travelers take the experience back home and perceive the society on the basis of their overall feelings and experiences. Nash (1995) writes that tourism has become an obviously important social fact for travel experiences often are among the most outstanding memories in the traveler's life and a portion of it passes to the family and then to the society. Travel process always embraces a number of encounters and interactions in a give-and-take affair which ends up with reciprocal acculturation effects.

As per the claim of Cohen (1984) as well as Dann and Parrinello (2009), the continental Europe was the first region where the scientific study of tourism and its impacts on society and economy was conducted as it was the first region to experience mass tourism and its impacts on society. It seems that the first social scientific treatise on tourism in English was “*The Tourist Movement: An Economic Study*” written by Ogilvie (1933) followed by “*The Tourist Industry: A National and International Survey*” written by Norval (1936), though Cohen (1984) claims that the Italian L. Bodio published the first social scientific article on the subject in 1899 and L. Von Wiese was the first writer to publish specifically sociological writing on tourism in 1930 in German language. However, Dann and Parrinello (2009), who tried to explore the buried ideas of sociology of tourism in non-Anglophone Continental Europe, claimed that Mariotti (cited in Dann & Parrinello, 2009, p.25) was the first, with the exception of Bodio, to analyze tourism comprehensively in Italy in 1928; albeit from a quasi-exclusive economic perspective. Cohen further claims that the first full length sociological work on tourism, also in German, was the one written by H.J. Knebel in 1960. However, the study of tourism as a comprehensive sociological domain seemed to be emerged only in the 1970s with Boorstin’s (1964) diachronic view of American visitors to tourists, MacCannell’s (1973) theoretical synthesis and Cohen’s (1972) typological essay.

The contemporary sociological study on tourism has been gradually elaborating from the level of an individual activity to that of society, social relations and socio-cultural impacts of mass tourism on host communities. Sociologists became rather skeptical about the impacts of unplanned mass tourism and started scientific study and research over the impacts and implications of mass tourism on host society. This gave rise a concept of sociology of tourism with a basic theoretical underpinning though the concept is still immature and inadequately theorized. The major contributors to develop the conceptual foundation of the sociology of tourism are Boorstin (1962; 1964), Forster (1964), Cohen (1972;1979), MacCannell (1973), Turner (1973), de Kadt (1979), Leiper (1979), Greenwood (1982), Smith (1989), Harrison (1992), Nash (1989), Urry (1990), and Franklin (2004). Researchers in western world started to write about tourism differently from sociological dimensions that eventually helped to emerge two opposing hypotheses in sociology.

The first hypothesis is highly critical and mostly focused on negative sides of mass tourism in the society. This hypothesis portrayed tourism as pseudo-events (Boorstin, 1962; 1964) and in a form of imperialism (Nash, 1989) and neo-colonialism (Cohen, 1984) with exploitative attributes and thus compared with juggernaut – consumes and despoils one destination and rolls on to the next. The second hypothesis, on the other hand, accepted mass tourism as a symbol of modern society or postmodernity (Uriely, 1997) and is more affirmative. The third paradigm emerged later in between

these two opposing hypotheses with focus on alternative tourism in place of mass tourism that portrayed tourism as a strong agent of socio-economic transformation with a double bladed sword. Upon handling it carefully with an effective plan, it can be a panacea of poverty alleviation, socio-cultural preservation and environmental conservation otherwise it appears with an oxymoronic (Kunwar, 2010) surge - brings visitors to the land of virgin culture and fragile environment and ruins them. Thus, the third paradigm of tourism from sociological perspective stood in favor of planned, managed and controlled tourism.

The former view is established by Daniel J. Boorstin. Boorstin (1962; 1964) attacked mass tourism critically and established tourism as '*pseudo-event*' devised only for the western elites who also underwent a historical transformation from 'traveler to tourist'. Boorstin's (1964) major argument is that the people in the western world especially Americans thrive on unauthentic pseudo-events which lack authenticity and reality and thus the tourist has become a cultural dope, lured by inauthentic places and attractions. Boorstin (1964) also used the concept of escapism and nostalgia to explain the attributes of mass tourism. Davis (1979) later on explained '*nostalgia*' most appropriately with a brief etymological analysis of the term tracing its early medical references to the disease of homesickness. But it connotes the ancestry-sickness in tourism. Dann (1994) reinforced the concept of Boorstin stating that the modern tourism is a '*business of nostalgia*' in which modern tourists visit and enjoy the historical heritages, ancient forts and monuments, antique artifacts, archaeological sites, remote villages of age-old cultures and even modern luxury hotels and resorts having ancient themes in modern setup. Boorstin further states that the tourists are cultural idlers generated from modern institutions, especially mass media, and seek to enjoy the strangeness of the host environment and the local community from their own western perspective isolating them from the real world situation. According to Kunwar (2010), the typology of Boorstin's argument helps to qualify that all modern tourists seek illusory nature of human experience in the form of 'pseudo-events'. Kunwar also claims that Boorstin's approach was essentially 'diachronic' for the reason that he proposed a model for a historical transition from 'traveler to tourist'.

MacCannell (1973), who probably the first sociologist to anchor the tourism study in the mainstream of sociological theory, stated tourism as the quest of authenticity and termed it '*staged authenticity*' with the twin arguments that moderns seek authenticity outside modernity and the locals stage it for them. MacCannell stood against Boorstin and proposed contrasting view of tourism as '*staged authenticity*'. Boorstin focused on inauthenticity whereas MacCannell (1973; 1976) considered an affirmative view of tourism and explained that tourism is a symbol of modern society and a quest of authenticity. MacCannell described tourism as a modern pilgrimage stating that

the two are homologous and tourist as a pilgrim of the contemporary secular world in search of 'authentic experiences' that manifest everywhere in our society. He claims that travel allows visitors to recapture virginal sensations of discovery just like children in tour are permitted to enter bank vaults, to see a million dollars and to touch cows' udders. The end of the last century witnessed the rise of non-Western tourism and the post-modern twist in Western tourism. The postmodern thinkers aggressively denied the existence of "originals" in the contemporary world (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). Baudrillard (1994) was one of them who claimed the modern world thriving on simulacra.

Turner's (1973) conceptual contribution is highly regarded in tourism though he did not contribute theoretically anything in sociology of tourism. However, his conceptual clarity on pilgrims, in line of MacCannell's (1973) notion of tourism as a modern pilgrimage, with three stage ritual process namely *Separation*, *Liminality* and *Reintegration* has a significant contribution to the sociology of tourism. According to Turner, the first stage is social and spatial *Separation* in which the individual is taken to an unfamiliar peripheral place of abode separating the person from his/her ordinary social group. Turner's second stage of pilgrims is *Liminality* (from Latin word *limen* means threshold) in which the individual crossed the threshold of his ordered world, finds himself in a state of anti-structure, out of time and place where his ordinary role, status, recognition and obligations are suspended. In this stage, an individual also confronts with the fundamental symbols of his culture and undergoes a direct experience of the sacred invisible supernatural order. His third stage of pilgrims is the stage of *Reintegration* in which an individual reintegrates into his ordinary social group in his place of abode usually in new roles and a higher social status.

Cohen (1984) attempted for many years to construct a sociology of tourism, conducting many theoretical and empirical studies. Cohen emphasized sociology of tourism as an emergent specialty concerned with the study of touristic motivations, roles, relationships, and institutions and of their impact on tourists and on the societies who receive them. Cohen (1979) has recommended four perspectives for theory development of tourism on sociology: processual, contextual, comparative and emic perspectives. He has also suggested four types of touristic situations: authentic, staged authenticity, denial of authenticity and contrived. Cohen portrayed the modern form of tourism as a part of 'neo-colonialism' when analyzing touristic relationship between the western and developing countries.

Nash (1989) is also in a notion that tourism is a modern form of 'imperialism' since the industry encourages investments from international organizations in developing countries and these organizations eventually drain out the huge segment of tourism economy back to their home country. They also make the developing destination highly dependent on them and consequently results in a power dominance relationship

between ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ nations. Nash (1995) further explains tourism study from three different perspectives: development or acculturation, personal transition and superstructure. The development or acculturation perspective considers that there has been an association of tourism with changes at the host end of the touristic process and is responsible for changes in a host society and its setting. The notion of personal transition approach of tourism study has stemmed up through the socio-psychological foundation of tourist experiences and reactions which appears to be quite a variety of long and short term effects. A number of them appear not to be comprehended by even a broadened and deepened conception of liminality (Turner, 1973) – the notion that the experience of significant change through travel tends to de-structure or open up the individual subjective world where the structured certainties of ordinary life dissolve into an undifferentiated state that can have a sacred aura and involve feelings of parity with associates. Thinking of tourism as a kind of dependent superstructure – the third perspective that is how different elements of socio-cultural systems relate to each other and the manner in which a society maintains itself and changes.

Social thinkers also began to come out with a divergent notion. Inspired from Foucault’s concept of the “gaze”, Urry (1990) made another theoretical opening of the *tourist gaze*. Urry termed ‘gaze’ to denote the core notion of the social construction of what tourists see, how they behave, and what services, facilities and attractions are provided to them. The term is often associated to discourses, allegories or even practices of seeing consuming contexts. The act of gazing is connecting to a much deeper cultural matrix that gives meaning to what is being watched (Korstanje & Seraphin, 2017). Urry (1990) categorized tourists’ sites into three broad segments: historical or modern, authentic or inauthentic and romantic or collective; and distinguished three types of gazes: romantic, individual and solitary. He further viewed that the tourist-gaze varies from culture and time and the gaze transforms areas of terror and fear into commoditized landscapes that are engaged to an ‘imperial economy’. Urry has given some thought provoking concept like post-modern development and mobility context of tourism through *spectatorial gaze*, *reverential gaze*, *anthropological gaze*, *environmental gaze* and *mediatized gaze* to explain the transformation of aesthetic production into tourist commodity, commodification and consumption of culture, style and taste, universalization of tourist gaze and popularity of heritage industry as an important element of tourist gazing.

But before becoming *tourist gaze* a mature paradigm for the sociological study, John Urry himself turned away from the ‘gaze’ to embrace the wider concept of ‘*mobilities paradigm*’ (Urry, 2000; Urry, 2007) perhaps due to the heavy attack from critics over the *tourist gaze* that the concept is ocular-centrism by focusing on the visual consumption of the tourism landscapes i.e. sightseeing ignoring other important

senses, bodily experiences, feeling of adventures etc. It is obvious that tourism is not only the industry of sightseeing, it is the industry of feelings, experiences and experiments alike. Yasumura (1994) has proposed the levels of sociological space in four strata of a concentric circle as 'actors' at the center of the circle and 'social interaction', 'social system' and the 'modern world-system' respectively towards the outer circle. With the help of this model, Yasumura has classified and connected all sociological works on tourism into 'tourist-types', 'host-guest relations', 'socio-cultural impacts' and 'international mass tourism' to synchronize, connect and explain the strata of the model from sociological perspective. The model gives a good fit between sociology and tourism. Ritzer and Liska (1997) as well as Uriely (1997) used the terminology "*postmodern tourists*" to indicate the contemporary tourists whose craving interest for fun and enjoyment replaced the quest for authenticity. These developments moved the sociological study of tourism largely away from the issue of authenticity. Tourist sites had been increasingly '*McDisneyized*', where tourists seek experiences that are predictable, efficient, calculable and controlled (Ritzer & Liska, 1997).

Some of the historical events of the last quarter of century such as collapse of the East European communist regimes (including Soviet Union), emergence of new economies in Latin America (Brazil) and Asia (China, India, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore), Asian financial crisis of 1997, global financial crisis of 2007-08 and 2010-12, September 11 attacks in the US in 2001 and the catastrophic natural disasters of tsunamis, hurricanes and earthquakes around the globe during last decade have affected the global dynamics of contemporary sociology and tourism (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). The most significant undercurrent forces in this connection, as noted by Cohen and Cohen (2012), are a shift from a synchronic to a diachronic perspective, involving a change of emphasis from permanence to flux, from being to doing, from structure to agency, from sedimented social patterns to the process of their emergence, from a focus on the more stable fixtures of social life to the mobilities linking them, a post-modern tendency to stress the de-differentiation between social domains, a cultural pluralization, a fragmentation of life styles, the break-down of conventional binary concepts, the interpenetration between formerly opposite categories and the blurring of the border between reality and virtuality.

In this mix-up, the sociological approaches to analyze and interpret the nature of tourism and its relationship with society also underwent a widespread transformation. Western societies, especially after 1960, experienced a wide scale of people's movement as tourists. Urry (2000) focused on diverse mobilities of peoples, objects, images, information and wastes. His argument is that these diverse mobilities are materially transforming the 'social as society' into 'social as mobility'. Such mobilities as per him include imaginative travel, movements of images and information, virtual travel,

object travel and corporeal travel. Cohen and Cohen (2012) posit that the mobilities model implicitly destabilizes some of the basic common-sense binary concepts on which the sociological approach to tourism has been unreflectively grounded. They claim that the binary border is blurring between home and away, hosts and guests, domestic and international with the phenomenal development of multi-generational diasporic communities (natal home visit for older generation but away from home for the younger one), growing number of new nomadism among youth Westerners without fixed place of abode, de-exoticization of extraordinariness, migration from the new to the old home, growth of global cosmopolitanism and so on. Gale (2009) has coined a catchphrase to address the contemporary process of mobilities as '*the end of tourism*'.

Another innovative approach in the re-orientation of contemporary sociology of tourism is "*Performativity*" (Cohen & Cohen, 2012) which is inspired heavily from Goffman's (1959) performance approach to social interaction. Cohen and Cohen has narrated the deployment of this approach in tourism literatures in two different principal modes: moderate and radical. The moderate mode is rather static and focuses the stage in a more liberal sense, particularly on tourist attractions, cultural performances and events whereas the radical mode of performativity goes beyond it and includes non-lingual symbolic acts, gestures, salutations, prostrations etc. and focuses on how performative acts 'do things' to constitute a reality-in-becoming, rather than reflect a social structure. This approach thus denies an independent standing to social entities, including tourists' settings, such as destinations, attractions or events but sees them as dynamic products of the performative acts of the public (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). Hannam, Sheller and Urry (2006) claims that the concept of 'mobilities paradigm' is against the ontology of distinct 'places' or 'people'. There is rather a complex relationality between places and persons connected through both performances and performativities. Hence places are not so much fixed but are implicated within complex networks by which hosts, guests, buildings, objects and machines are continually brought together to perform certain performances (Hannam, Sheller, & Urry, 2006, p. 13). The implications of the performativity perspective for conventional conceptions of "destination" and "attractions", and for the study of tourist images, are far-reaching, but have not yet been worked out sufficiently in contemporary tourism studies (Cohen & Cohen, 2012).

Another contemporary theoretical development in sociological theories of tourism is *Actor-Network Theory* (Latour, 2005; Johannesson, 2005; Paget, Dimanche, & Mounet, 2010; Duim, Ren, & Johannesson, 2012). Latour (2005), the principal protagonist of this theory, argues that the 'social' is not the glue which holds society together; rather 'it is what is glued together by many other types of connectors'. He views that it is a very peculiar movement of re-association and reassembling a trail

of associations between heterogeneous elements and the social becomes visible only by the traces it leaves when a new association is being produced between elements which themselves are by no means social. Actor-networks are hybrid, heterogeneous configurations of material and semantic relations (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). Actor-Network Theory (ANT) is applied in tourism to assess the relationship between actors (human) and factors (non-human) that contribute to build a network. The theory basically studies society in terms of the relationships between people and objects, all of which are network of relations in themselves. Actor-Network Theory (Johannesson, 2005) which investigates and evaluates the relationship between human actors and heterogeneous non-human factors (Johannesson, 2005; Paget, Dimanche, & Mounet, 2010) seems to be an innovative research model since tourism itself is a packaged industry of heterogeneous bundles.

Cohen and Cohen (2012) claims that the novel conceptual and theoretical developments such as *mobilities*, *performativity* and *actor-network theory* in the field beyond the discourses of 'authenticity' and the 'tourist gaze', are closely related to a broader meta-theoretical re-orientation in contemporary sociology and philosophy. However, Winter (2009) argues the rapid rise in non-Western tourism, especially from Asia, has left tourism studies conceptually ill-equipped as most of its theories have been generated from and applied to Western contexts. Uriely (1997) proposed that postmodernity in tourism created a new sociological form to analyze the postmodern phenomena of travel that offer memorable experiences including adventure tourism, experiential tourism, authentic tourism, virtual tourism etc. As per Pretes (1995), in postmodern societies objects become representation and are transformed into commodities to be packaged and consumed. Franklin (2004) discussed 'tourism ordering' as a new ontology in which he explained a touristic world with heterogeneous assemblage; a world to be seen, felt, interpellated and travelled. Cohen and Cohen (2019) have recently tried to shift discourse on sociological study of tourism towards seven topics: emotions, sensory experiences, materialities, gender, ethics, authentication and the philosophical groundings of tourism theories.

Conclusion

Sociology of Tourism has been a diachronic ontology since 1960s onward. When tourism lost its aristocratic premise of grand tour and gained the attribute of mass movement, researchers specially sociologists became skeptical of mass tourism with both positive and negative contemplation. In the decade of 60s, tourism embodied a business of nostalgia (Dann, 1994). Tourists became antiquarians and desired to be submerged into the past sentiments and enjoy the reminiscence of history, heritages, nature, culture and civilizations. They sought pleasure in temporary escape from the modern hectic life to experience and enjoy the wilderness of nature, historical heritages, ancient villages, age-old cultures etc. perhaps driven by their subconscious

mind towards the recollection of ancestry era just to satiate the nostalgic sickness.

Boorstin (1962; 1964) disdained mass tourism as a producer of pseudo-events. Nunez's (1963) acculturation, MacCannell's (1973) staged authenticity, Cohen's (1984) new-colonialism and commercialized hospitality, Nash's (1989) imperialism, Urry's (1990) tourist gaze, Cohen and Cohen's (2012) mobilities, performativities and actor-network, Uriely's (1997) postmodernity etc. had their own charms and space in sociology of tourism though none of them could established their apparent hegemony. Techno-based virtual reality with high-end entertainment applications and simulators is also gaining a momentum in modern tourism ranging from just visiting archaeological sites or hang-gliding to mountaineering or space travel. Modern visitors are enjoying '*augmented reality*' combining real world experiences with virtual elements. Mobile apps are being tourism friendly. Even museums are increasingly using augmented reality allowing visitors to view artefacts with their original appearance overlaying virtual sphere.

The idea and imagination of sustainable development caught the attention of tourism researcher since 1990. In social dimensions, Swarbrooke (2002) suggests that sustainable tourism means socially fair tourism which needs what he calls the *four Es: equity, equal opportunities, ethics and equal partnerships* between hosts and tourists. Sharma (2018) believes that the concept of sustainable tourism evolved as the antithesis of mass tourism, especially with and after the wider realization of tourism's negative impacts and implications over various aspects. Jafari (2003) articulates that when both the positive and negative aspects of tourism had been conjured, research attention was drawn on those alternative forms of tourism developments which were potentially sustainable, with minimal unwanted consequences. Though sustainability has become a buzz word and a well conversed thesis in tourism industry, the problem as yet is how to measure the sustainability parameters effectively and efficiently. The conceptual debate of sustainable development in tourism is still there. The concept, though theoretically excellent, is in trouble behaviorally for the reason that the trade-off between economic development within the parameters of ecological conservation as well as socio-cultural preservation is extremely challenging (Sharma, 2016) and there is also a vagueness of measurement parameters yet. This paper has thus focused on stakeholders' happiness (Sharma, 2018) as a parameter of analysis for sustainable development of tourism of any destination.

Each and every activity of human being including travel is directed towards the happiness. Happiness is the ultimate goal of all human beings. There are a wide range of approaches, definitions and explanations of happiness from biological to psychological and from religious to philosophical perspectives. Whichever is the perspective, the consensus of the meaning of happiness (Veenhoven, 2008) comes around a mental situation of well-being with pleasant emotions ranging from just a positive feeling to

the intense delight (Sharma, 2018). Durkheim's concept of anomie and Marx's concept of alienation also refer an individual's state of mind but the difference of happiness from anomie or alienation is that the happiness denotes a positive state of mind rather than negative one. There are mainly two kinds of happiness paradigms in general discourses – *hedonic* and *eudaemonic* (*eudaemonic*) (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Deci & Ryan, 2006). The *hedonic* perspective focuses on subjective well-being (SWB) (Diener, 1984), which is a broad category of phenomena that includes people's emotional responses, domain satisfactions and global judgements of life satisfaction (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). It is more extrinsic and relatively momentary. Likewise, the *eudaemonic* (Waterman, 1993) perspective focuses on psychological well-being (PWB), self-realization and personal growth. This kind of happiness is more intrinsic and enduring and thus connected with individual attitudes and behaviors.

The ultimate goal of tourists is happiness – be it *hedonic* or *eudaemonic*. Other stakeholders of a destination such as tourism entrepreneurs, workers and professionals employed in tourism industry, the community in which tourism thrives and the government also seek ultimate happiness through tourism though their means and modes of happiness might be different. Making all stakeholders of a destination equally happy is extremely challenging, if not impossible, due to the fact that the happiness of one stakeholder might be the reason of unhappiness for the other. On the other hand, sustainable development of tourism (Murphy, 2001) cannot be dreamt up in any destination without the happiness of stakeholders. The variables of socio-cultural sustainability, economic sustainability and ecological sustainability are juxtaposed in many cases. A trade-off among these pillars is inevitable in a destination for the sustainability of tourism. Hence, a '*happiness-sustainability*' continuum is a promisingly pertinent hypothesis in tourism researches especially in sociological domain. However, the study of happiness is not a well-established premise of sociology as yet in spite of its inclusion by the founding father sociology, Auguste Comte. His notion of '*Bonheur*' (happiness) as a state of intellectual enlightenment combined with sacral feelings of inclusion and consensus that result from social progress is allied work with the context. As a linkage to this premise, the author has proposed stakeholders' happiness model elsewhere (Sharma, 2018) as a breakthrough to fulfill the methodological dearth specially realized in the study of sustainability, particularly on sociology of tourism. It is under the notion that travel is a '*journey towards happiness*'. It is believed that '*happiness*' will be a livening paradigm in sociology of tourism in the days to come.

References

- Abraham, M. F. (2011). *Modern sociological theory: An introduction*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1962). *The image; or what happened to the American dream ?* New York: Atheneum.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1964). *The image: A guide to pseudo-events in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bottomore, T. B. (1986). *Sociology: A guide to problems and literature*. New Delhi: Blackie & Son (India) Ltd.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geography*, 24(1), 5-12.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Toward a sociology of international tourism. *Social Research*, 39, 164-182.
- Cohen, E. (1974). Who is a tourist ? A conceptual clarification. *Sociological Review*, 22, 527-555.
- Cohen, E. (1979). Rethinking the sociology of tourism. *Sociology*, 13, 179-201.
- Cohen, E. (1984). The sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues and findings. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 10, 373-392.
- Cohen, E., & Cohen, S. A. (2012). Current sociological theories and issues in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 2177-2202.
- Cohen, S. A., & Cohen, E. (2019). New directions in the sociology of tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(2), 153-172.
- Dann, G. M. (1994). There's no business like old business : Tourism, the nostalgia industry of the future. In W. F. Theobald (Ed.), *Global Tourism* (pp. 29-43). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Dann, G. M., & Parrinello, G. L. (Eds.). (2009). *The sociology of tourism: European origins and development* (Vol. 12). UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Davis, F. (1979). *Yearning for yesterday. A sociology of nostalgia*. New York: Free Press.
- de Kadt, E. (Ed.). (1979). *Tourism: Passport to development ?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2006). Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 1-11.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95, 542-575.

- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276-302.
- Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: Methodology and research inferences. *Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings of Travel and Tourism Research Association* (pp. 195-198). San Diego: Travel and Tourism Research Association.
- Duim, V. V., Ren, C., & Johannesson, G. T. (2012). *Actor-network theory and tourism: Ordering, materiality and multiplicity*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Ekeh, P. P. (1974). *Social Exchange Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Forster, J. (1964). The sociological consequences of tourism. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 5, 217-227.
- Franklin, A. (2004). Tourism as an ordering towards a new ontology of tourism. *Tourist Studies*, 277-301.
- Furham, A. (1984). Tourism and cultural shock. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11, 41-57.
- Gale, T. (2009). Urban beaches, virtual worlds and "The end of tourism". *Mobilities*, 4(1), 119-138.
- Goeldner, C. R., & Ritchie, J. B. (2012). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies* (12th ed.). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor.
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 26, 91-108.
- Greenwood, D. J. (1982). Cultural "authenticity". *Cultural Survival Quarterly*(6.3).
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, immobilities, moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Harrison, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Tourism & the Less Developed Countries*. London: Belhaven Press.
- Jafari, J. (2003). Research and scholarship: The basis of tourism education. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, Vol.14(No.1), Pp 6-16.
- Jafari, J. (2005). *Tourism Research: Revamping Old Challenges for Integrative Paradigms*. Mexico: Anais do VII Congreso Nacional y I Internacional de Investigacion Turistica, Guadalajara.
- Johannesson, G. T. (2005). Tourism translations: Actor-network theory and tourism research. *Tourism Studies*, 5(2), 133-150.

- Korstanje, M., & Seraphin, H. (2017). Revisiting the sociology of consumption in tourism. In S. K. Dixit (Ed.), *Handbook of consumer behaviour in tourism and hospitality* (pp. 1-16). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kunwar, R. R. (2010). *Tourists and Tourism: Science and Industry Interface*. Kathmandu: Ganga Sen Kunwar.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leiper, N. (1979). The framework of tourism towards a definition of tourism, tourist, and the tourist industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6, 390-407.
- Macbeth, J. (2005). Towards an ethics platform for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 638-657.
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 589-603.
- MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: Macmillan.
- Medeiros, B. F. (2017). The sociology of tourism. In Lohmann, G. & Netto, A. P. *Tourism Theory: Concepts, Models and Systems* (pp. 75-78). USA: CABI.
- Murphy, P. E. (2001). Tourism and sustainable development. In W. F. Theobald (Ed.), *Global tourism* (pp. 173-190). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Nash, D. (1989). Tourism as a form of imperialism. In Smith, V. (Ed.), *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nash, D. (1995). Prospects for tourism study in anthropology. In Ahmed, A. S. , & Shore, C. N. (Eds.), *The Future of Anthropology: Its Relevance to the Contemporary World, London and Atlantic Highlands* (pp. 179-202). NJ: Athnole.
- Norval, A. J. (1936). *The Tourist Industry: A National and International Survey*. London: Pitman.
- Nunez, T. (1963). Tourism, tradition, and acculturation. *Ethnology*, 2, 347-352.
- Ogilvie, F. W. (1933). *The Tourist Movement: An Economic Study*. London: Staples.
- Paget, E., Dimanche, F., & Mounet, J. P. (2010). A tourism innovative case: An actor-network approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), 828-847.
- Pretes, M. (1995). Post modern tourism: The Santa Claus industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22, 1-15.
- Przeclawski, K. (1993). Tourism as the subject of interdisciplinary research. In Pearce, D. G. & Butler, R. W. (Eds.), *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges* (pp. 9-19). London: Routledge.

- Ritzer, G., & Liska, A. (1997). McDisneyization and 'post-tourism': Contemporary perspectives on contemporary tourism. In *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Tourism* (pp. 96-109).
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.
- Sharma, R. (2016). Tourism and sustainability: A dichotomy debate and the theory of mean. *Pokhara Management Review*, 6, 62-69.
- Sharma, R. (2018). *Tourism and sustainability in Pokhara, Nepal : A study from happiness perspective*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Tribhuvan University, Nepal.
- Smith, V. (Ed). (1989). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Swarbrooke, J. (2002). *The Development and Management of Visitor Attractions*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Turner, V. (1973). The center out there: Pilgrim's goal. *History of Religions*, 2, 191-230.
- UNESCO. (1976). The effects of tourism on socio-cultural values. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4, 74-105.
- Uriely, N. (1997). Theories of modern and postmodern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 982-985.
- Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Urry, J. (2000). Mobile sociology. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), 185-203.
- Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Veenhoven, R. (2008). Healthy happiness: Effects of happiness on physical health and consequences for preventive health care. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 449-464.
- Wahab, S. E. (1975). *Tourism Management*. London: Tourism International Press.
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaemonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 678-691.
- Winter, T. (2009). Asian tourism and the retreat of Anglo-Western centrism in tourism theory. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(1), 21-31.
- Yasumura, K. (1994). *The sociological sphere of tourism as a social phenomenon (workshop paper)*. Japan: Hokkai Gakuen University.