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Abstract

This thesis considers how conflicting ideas of the acceptable and unacceptable in tourism are conceptualised by tourism actors. A flexibly designed, meaning-based case study of a small-scale tourism business in a peripheral area of Finnmark is developed in successive stages. Theoretical consideration is given to tourism’s present meaning(s) relative to past understandings, and how tourism worlds can be imagined through opposing stories that both connect with, and diverge from, one another. This leads on to questions of how the structured consequences of tourism actors’ position in the world determine how they see the world. The implications of how place and identity meanings can change for tourism actors are considered. This study concludes by identifying how place and identity meanings can shift for tourism actors. It also identifies how meanings that may seem to conflict are interrelated and (re)produced.

**Key words:** conflict, meaning(s), (un)acceptable, story, world(s)
1. Introduction

Early in my Master’s work, I wrote an assignment on Japan’s Hiroshima Peace Park. One of my aims was to consider how tourism today has used past meaning(s) to create a major dark tourism site. Of course, the site is not without controversy, and interpretations of how it represents the past are contested. Nevertheless, the event the site commemorates is beyond dispute. Past meanings, however, are not always reflected in current tourism practice. For example, the cumulative effects of climate change are now well understood. However, this has not led to a reduction in the phenomenon of tourism that, itself, contributes to climate change.

This thesis reflects on how the present is informed by understandings of the past in tourism; and how - in these terms - tourism actors conceptualise their understandings of the (un)acceptable in practice. My central question considers how aspects of history, environment, culture and heritage, and their meanings, are seen as (un)acceptable in informants’ tourism. This question also considers my informants understandings of these meanings of these aspects. In this way, the thesis considers how past meanings influence informants’ understanding(s) of tourism today.

The study’s focus is on the meanings my main subject uses in constructing the (un)acceptable in tourism practice. In this way, the study is an attempt to illuminate tourism understandings, and shed some analytical light on the interpretation of those understandings.

My general approach has been qualitative, naturalistic, interpretive and reflexive. This approach will be elaborated on in my Methodology chapter. Above all, my approach has been flexible. My research brings a flexible design to a single in-depth case study. In carrying out such a study, I have gone for depth rather than breadth. I use field interviews, field observations and field notes as empirical data. I then relate these data to relevant theory from the literature in my data analysis. In taking an abductive approach in my research, I have gone back and forth, repeatedly, between field experience and abstract theoretical explanations. As someone with limited time and resources, the case study method has provided me with a framework in which I could practically work. I have tried to arrive at useful interpretations. However, personal intuition led me to my empirical context, and also often informed how I carried out my research. In this sense, Particular attention has been given ‘to how one thinks about thinking’ on my own part (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). While this study is not concerned with the generalisability, it may lead to further discussion in the areas that it considers.
2. Background

The empirical context is an island off the coast of north-east Finnmark, situated at a latitude of 70 degrees north. The study’s mains subject is a Sami native of the island. His family has lived on the island for seven generations. The business he runs with his wife is situated among high mountains and deep fjords. Some of the factors that attract tourists to the location include the island’s National Park and activities such as hiking, glacier treks, fishing, boating, snowmobiling and hunting. As my informant’s tourism practice goes back two generations, I have considered the research context as it a suitable context to suitable in which to consider how tourism today uses past meaning(s) in tourism practice.

2.1 Research question

My research question addresses aspects of history, environment, culture and heritage, and their meanings, for informants; and how these meanings are informed by what is seen as (un)acceptable in tourism practice by my main informant. These include … In this way, the thesis considers how past meanings influence informants’ understanding(s) of current tourism practice. My central question has suggested other areas of interest. One of these is how the meanings informing the idea of the (un)acceptable in the empirical context have been constructed. As meanings are both produced and reproduced, my research also considers the (re)production of meaning. Since the world is seldom structured into neatly meaningful categories, consideration is also given to how rigid, or essentialised, categories may be contested, problematised and relativised. In this sense, I consider tensions that can emerge in the conceptualisation of what is seen as (un)acceptable.

2.2 Structure of paper

In this chapter, I have introduced my research project and my research question, and given some background on the empirical context. In Chapter Two, I describe the methodological approach I have taken in addressing my research question. I discuss flexible design, field interviews, making field observations, and taking field notes. I also consider my descriptions of empirical data, relative to theory and analysis. Consideration is then given to this study’s ethical dimensions. In Chapter Three, I review concepts and theories that seemed useful to me in data analysis. In Chapter Four, I present that data analysis. In Chapter Five, I give an overview of my case study, in terms of how it developed from start to finish. I make a summary of my research interpretations. I then consider what
questions this study might raise for future research. In this way, I reflect on what implications my study could have for the practice field. This is informed by Doorne and Ateljevic (2004) identifying the absence of research that critically examines tourism performance in the context of entrepreneurship (Doorne and Ateljevic, 194).
3. Theory

In bringing theoretical perspectives to bear on empirical data, this chapter aims to clarify and substantiate research findings described in the following chapter. This chapter identifies literature sources that may shed light on the research question. That question is: histories, practices, objects, and the meanings they entail, though excluded from tourism, may be reconsidered in tourism terms if given new meanings. Specific areas suggested by empirical data are identified: Identity expression in Norway’s Far North: Meaning and identity: Commoditisation and identity: Identity: temporality, history, longitude. This is not a comprehensive selection but is designed to identify areas that I believe are important to understand relative to my research question and in an attempt to widen understandings.

3.1 Identity Expression in Norway’s Far North

In this section, Norway’s ‘magical’ far north is shown to reflect ethnic ambiguity. Complex identity perceptions are considered relative to hybrid identities. Current representations of Sámi identity in tourism are seen in terms of ‘non-threatening’ narratives in a context of contested ethnicity. The challenging of essentialist conceptualisations of place and identity is considered where identity markers (plural) are sometimes reduced to single categories. The question of how imaginaries allow ‘worlds’ to become accessible to tourism is addressed. Additional consideration is given to how patterns of movement affect identity’s maintenance or loss.

Fonneland (2017, 171) describes Norway’s far north as a ‘magic region’. She considers how the magical Aurora Borealis and Arctic magic are reflected in promotion of the region. Today’s marketing of Sámi culture reflects a tendency to highlight religious conceptions in which ‘an aura of magic is established’ (ibid. 174). Nowadays, flexible tourism actors can appeal both to spiritual and secular tourists (ibid.). Actors may draw on both trends in the spiritual milieu, and on Pine and Gilmore’s ‘experience economy’ (1998). In the experience economy consumers are concerned, not only with buying goods and services, but also with engaging and ‘transformative’ adventures (Fonneland, ibid. 175). To illustrate, Fonneland describes Finnmark’s Isogaisa festival, and its communicating cultures, traditions, symbols and narratives in ways that make them relevant in contemporary terms (2017, 234). She also explores how this festival is a ‘means of renegotiating or even producing new cultural forms’ (235).
Kramvig (2019, 45-7) suggests Sámi society has changed radically over the past thirty years. New images of Saaminess have emerged, and ‘Saaminess’ has become dynamic and situated (ibid.). However, the author suggests ethnicity, as a pure and homogeneous category, is not reflected in northern discourses of identity and ethnicity. Rather, in opposition to Norwegian society, the ‘ethnically ambivalent topography’ of the country’s north has produced an insistence on ambiguity. Consequently, there is a need to ‘open up’ concepts such as ethnicity and identity in order to reflect differences and antagonisms (ibid.).

Mathiesen (2010, 54) considers the implications of displaying indigenous Sámi culture as a commodity. On the one hand, Sámi culture needs to stand out from modernity, and be experienced as exotic or different (ibid.). On the other, the exoticisation and ‘othering’ of tradition, authenticity and originality may legitimise differences between indigenous and majority populations (70). In this way, social equality may be threatened (2010, 53). Again, if some versions of history prevail over others, this may endanger consensus in small local communities (Mathiesen, 2009, 25). More seriously, this may lead to serious conflicts over competing versions of a common past (ibid.).

Olsen (39) describes how the process of Norwegianization resulted in two generations of Sámi ‘starting’ to see themselves as Norwegian. This development was most striking along northern Norway’s coast (i.e., the empirical context). After World War Two’s destruction, most reconstructed coastal sites were considered Norwegian. Material Sámi culture did not stand out here. On the contrary: Sámi culture was concealed, since seen as coming from the past. Cultural features and artefacts seen as Sámi symbols disappeared from social spheres (ibid. 41). During this time (i.e., the 1960s), many Sámi children in coastal communities stopped learning their native language. This ‘highly symbolic change of language’ reduced the distinctiveness of Sámi-speaking coastal communities (ibid).

Olsen (3) identifies one characteristic of tourism as the creation of images that tourists recognise. In this sense, Sámi people have relied on a ‘cultural image of the group’, in the absence of institutions connected with a nation state (4). In consequence, emblematic tourism images have often shown Sámi culture as a ‘counter-concept’ to modern culture (ibid.). The idea of the Sámi belonging to a different conceptual category is reflected further, in their ‘investing’ in a non-Norwegian culture
However, while Sámi remain distinct from ‘modern Norwegians’, they have also (apparently) been integrated into the ‘average Norwegian way of living’. In this sense, Olsen speaks of ‘hybrid identities’: that is, identities that reflect a blend of diverse traditions and cultures.

Kramvíg (2005) suggests 2017’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, set up to address state repression of Sámi and Kven populations, needs to look at that repression’s consequences. She identifies a need to meet, and learn from, experience and knowledge among ‘different people and establishments’. The author believes many stories still need to be told and listened to. Addressing ‘knowledge as living projects’ can lead to histories being rethought, and rewritten, in the context of ‘relationships of difference’. Sámi storytelling practices should serve as an organising device in this process (ibid.).

3.2 Stories and Meaning(s)

This section considers meaning in terms of place and landscape. How meaning production relates to what is acceptable tourism practice is addressed. The dominant social imaginary concept is contrasted with personal imaginings. Attention is given to the potential of old narratives to become tourism mainstays. The historical dimensions of identity expression are also considered, relative to repressed or painful stories and experiences. Salazar (2012, 864) sees imaginaries as ‘representational assemblages’ that interact with people’s personal imaginings and are used as ‘meaning-making and world shaping devices’. The author suggests the imaginary both produces meanings and is the result of meaning production. Imaginaries are ‘complex systems of presumption’ and ‘patterns of forgetfulness and attentiveness’ (ibid. 864). In this sense, they may determine what is taken into account, and what is left out, in tourism practice. Salazar describes imaginaries as implicit ways of interpreting, rather than ‘explicit ideologies’ (ibid). The imaginary enters subjective experience as the expectation that things ‘will (generally) make sense’ (ibid.).

De la Barre (2013, 826-8) suggests meaning-based approaches can challenge essentialist conceptualisations of tourism identity and place. The author suggests a sense of place intersects with identity in various ways. She describes sense of place as how places are ‘known, imagined, yearned for, held, remembered, voiced, lived, contested and struggled over’ (Feld and Basso, 1996: ibid). Meaningful places become part of who people
are, how they understand themselves, and their place in the world (Holloway and Hubbard, 2001: ibid.). However, to consider the concept of place critically, the idea of contested place is required. It ‘ought to be obvious that there is no single genuine essence’ (Shurmer-Smith, 2002: ibid.). Hence, the author also characterises place in terms of ‘complex local place-based struggles and challenges’ as well as of ‘not-so-obvious contested place meanings and uses’ (838).

De la Barre cites Edward M. Bruner’s view that old narratives are the mainstay of tourism imaginaries (a mainstay, that is, as an important means of support). Old narratives may reflect a reaction to globalisation, and reaffirm local identity and pride. On the other hand, any place narrative may suppress as much as it reveals (835).

Hewison (1987, 43-7) suggests the past is the foundation of individual and collective identity. Identity’s meaning derives from personal and family history, and the language and customs that govern social lives. Hence, identity’s meaning lies in the continuity of past and present. However, interpretations of the past are liable to change. If it is seen in terms of decline, change may threaten to rupture the past. To preserve the past is, therefore, to preserve the self. Further, in the face of innovation and decay that change may bring, stable meanings enable the maintenance of identity.

Steiner and Reisinger (2006, 303-4) suggest that meaning precedes what is constructed, or understood, in experience. Meaning is a product of history, events, discoveries and the experiences of ‘people who came before’. It becomes something that is preserved and handed down as ‘heritage / destiny’ (ibid.). Every individual sees the world from a different perspective. These perspectives afford different and unique possibilities (ibid.). Steiner and Reisinger cite Cohen’s view that commodification can sustain local and ethnic identity by generating demand for, and attributing value to, that identity: in the process, preserving traditions that might otherwise disappear (1988: cit. 311).

3.3 Categories
While seeking to avoid a critique of distinctions such as concept and thing, human and non-human, subject and object, personhood and its enactment, Abram and Lien welcome a focus on how such categories are produced and reproduced (2011, 3). Rather than taking distinctions at face value, the authors are interested in how distinctions came about in the first place.

Galani-Mouta (2000) takes up the idea of distinctions in terms of the contrast between identity and the other. The author suggests identities are constructed mainly in relation to
difference. The meaning given to identity emerges within relations of difference, and of similarity, that are produced and conceptualised in terms of ‘the other’. However, the meaning of identity may be continuously ‘ruptured and transformed’ because of difference (205). Hence, the conceptualisation of identity seeks stability and integration. Like Abram and Lien (op. cit.), the author describes the importance of wider context(s) in identity’s creation. Identity cannot be understood unless related to particular power structures within specific historical contexts (215).

In terms similar to Galani-Mouta’s difference and the ‘other’, Salazar (2013, 390) identifies global tourism as the quintessential business of difference projection and the interpretive vehicle of ‘othering’ (390). Cultures seen as having tourism potential may even ‘other’ themselves. ‘Othering’ and difference projection involve the constant (re)production of stereotypes and categories of ethnic and cultural difference (ibid.). Again: globally circulating tourism imaginaries are ‘infused with outdated knowledge’ (391). Where stereotyping and outdated knowledge prevail, the author describes untangling colonial thought, ethnographic stereotypes and other cultural models of difference (391-2).

Salazar (2013, 672) suggests certain conceptions of culture have contributed to '(post)colonial essentialisations of ethnic entities’. The objectification, reification, homogenisation and naturalisation of peoples are used by tourism shareholders, from transnational corporations to tourists themselves (ibid.). Consequently, notions of place and locality often have ‘imagined identity and cultural belonging’ claims staked upon them (ibid.). In this respect, tourism uses simplified and historically fixed versions of local natural and cultural heritage (673). Cultures on ‘display’ are transformed into iconic visuals that are accompanied by standardised ethnographic information (674).

3.4 Comoditisation and identity
Lanfant (1995, 8) suggest the problematics of identity cannot be dissociated from commoditisation. When marketed in tourism, history and memory are recreated as tourist resources, cultural heritage is seen as capital to profit from, and ethnicity is exploited (ibid.). Commoditisation gives identity alternative meaning(s), when the tourism system starts to define identity’s values, signs, supports and markers (ibid.). In this sense, tourism (re)defines cultural identity and its meaning(s) for consumption. Lanfant (ibid. 26) goes
on to make a larger claim: there is nowhere a priori that may not be brought into tourism’s ‘embrace’ (26). Hence, there is virtually no aspect of identity in principle that cannot be introduced into tourism, so powerful and extensive is the aforesaid embrace.

Cohen (2014) defines commoditisation as a process where activities and objects are evaluated primarily in terms of their exchange value; thereby, becoming goods and services (380). Comoditisation is a product of tourism, and local culture often serves as the principal example of such commoditisation (372). Culture is performed, or produced, for touristic consumption (ibid.). In being commoditised, tourism products are contrived or fabricated. Comoditisation ‘allegedly’ destroys the authenticity of products and human relations for locals and tourists (375). In this context, Cohen states that local culture may be commoditised or expropriated by anyone (ibid.). Eventually, commoditisation may even make products and relations ‘meaningless’ (ibid.).

It remains to be said: while commoditisation may change cultural products or add new meanings to old ones, it does not necessarily destroy their original meaning (Cohen, 371). Further, just as novelty need not make new cultural products inauthentic, tourism products (even if commoditised) can acquire new meaning for their producers. In the process, commoditisation may be ‘emicly perceived’ as ‘less of a change than it appears to an external analyst’ (382).

Cohen raises the question of what happens to the ‘other meanings’ of things and activities, once commoditised under the impact of tourism (380-1). In this respect, the loss of meaning seems an overgeneralisation, and counter-examples can readily be found (381). To commoditisation’s credit, the emergence of a commodifying tourist market frequently facilitates the preservation of a cultural tradition that could otherwise perish (382). Hence, rather than being taken for granted, the destructive impact of commoditisation should be submitted to detailed empirical examination: if possible, within an ‘emic, processual and comparative framework’ (383).

Hollinshead (1999, 19) takes an openly critical view of commodification in tourism. The author suggests that much of the world is becoming commodified. Relative to tourism: identity is often re-fabricated through ‘pernicious vogue story-lines’ and ‘cleverly managed representations’ (ibid.). The author believes most public discourse in tourism decontextualises, destroys or denies ‘the possibility of other / alternative / different discourses’. Taking Disney World as an example, he suggests commodity-satisfying entertainment has become a form of power by which people ‘self-police’. In this sense,
tourists seek out what are merely self-affirming myths (Selwyn 1996: ibid.). The ‘tourism system’ simply produces ‘mythical fantasies’ and ‘relationships of politico-economic and cultural dependence’ (ibid.).

Paulgaard (2008) suggests that commoditisation has a quasi-profane quality (16). Indigenous communities - in particular - need to deal, not only with the agonistics of current development and the new accessibility of consumer goods for all, but also the coterminous loss of appreciation of sacred / spiritual ‘things’ (16).

3.5 Identity: temporality, longitude and history

Bærenholdt et al. (2004, 11) suggest most environments that attract tourists have not been produced for that purpose. Such environments have other histories and geographies of nature, society and culture. Hence, ‘sedimented practices’ are central in the making of tourist places (2). Tourist places may be eroded, overlain by new sedimented practices and / or reconstructed at a later time (6). However, tourism today is less about going places than particular modes of relating to the world in contemporary cultures (ibid.). Tourism is a ‘way of being in the world: encountering, looking at it and making sense’ (ibid.). Tourism incorporates mindsets and performances that transform ‘places of the humdrum and ordinary; into the ‘apparently spectacular and exotic’ (ibid.). Places may only emerge as tourist places when they are appropriated, used and made part of the living memory, and accumulated life narratives, of people performing tourism (4).

Tourism places can produce particular temporalities, and may be ‘inscribed in circles of anticipation, performance and remembrance’ (ibid.). Tourism, and performances, include embodiments and social practices and traces of anticipated memories. Anticipations, and traces of future memories, materialise in the construction of ‘hybrid tourist places’ that bring together ‘memory flows, objects and matter’.

Bærenholdt et al (8) suggest temporality is fundamental to the ‘immediate’ experience of places and landscapes, as well as to the ‘many deeply sedimented practices inscribed in them over time’ (8). The fluidity of places is a question, not just of corporeal mobility, but also of mobile objects and imaginative mobilities (9). The temporalities and spatialities of tourist practices are ‘simultaneously material, social and cultural’ (ibid.). Mobilities interweave in ‘circuits of anticipation, performance and remembrance’ that ‘characterise tourist practices’ (ibid.). Tourist practices are ‘inscribed in the circular sequences before, during and after the ‘travel’ itself’ (ibid.).
Abram & Lien (1-2) suggest destinations (i.e., places) are seen as embedded in the materialities of landscapes, physical infrastructure and technologies, and in the temporalities of past, present and future. Material things and social relations are ‘brought into being and given agency through performative acts’ (4).

Simm and Marvell use the concept ‘palimpsest’ (2006, 128) to identify connections between past and present, and the processes that shape place identity over time. Originally, this term referred to a manuscript written over in which older text remains perceptible. ‘Palimpsest’ now refers to any layered phenomenon where cumulative layers can be observed. Marvell and Simm liken them to ‘artefacts or piecemeal layers in an archaeological excavation’ (cit). The authors suggest that place identity is constructed from understandings of the present, in combination with past understandings imposed on current knowledge and understanding. This combination includes historical, economic, environmental, political, social and cultural factors. These factors illustrate how, over time, places can acquire multiple meanings. They also show how place identity can be contested, and experienced, from a variety of different perspectives and circumstances’ (126). This variety produces an intertextual interpretation that can enable a richer, deeper sense of place (128). Hence, place identity can be seen as a temporal phenomenon that may be over-layered by another identity - or other identities - at other times.

Park (2010b: 66) considers the potential of heritage tourism to produce certain ritualised circumstances. Through these circumstances, shared social memory can be ‘collectively reminded and effectively communicated’. The author describes collective memory as a dynamic concept, reflecting present needs, circumstances and changes. She cites Halls view (1993) that identity is ‘an open, complex, unfinished game, always under construction’ (ibid.).

Like all historical phenomena, cultural identities ‘undergo constant transformation’ (Hall: ibid.). Cultural identity is subject to ‘the continuous ’play’ of history, culture and power’ (ibid.). Heritage is bound up with experiencing the past’s physical and psychological remnants (ibid.). Memory can be passed from generation to generation; so ‘transmigrating across multiple historical contexts’ (Bell, 2003: cited 96). Memory can be invented, acquired or embellished but, more often, ‘assume(s) a life-force of their own’ (ibid.)
4. Methodology

4.1 Introduction

Bourdieu and Waquant (1992, p. 228) describe the ‘properly social dimension’ of social science in these terms: the choice of insightful and reliable informants; how researchers present themselves; how researchers describe research aims, and how they enter the world under study. I will consider these dimensions in this section. In section two, consideration is given to the case study approach I took in my research. Further sections deal with interviews, and observation in data collection. In these sections, I consider how a combination of techniques led to my research’s flexible design. I also discuss the importance of reflexivity in qualitative research and consider this study’s ethical dimensions.

4.2 Research design

I entered my empirical context more by intuition than design (Tomaselli et al. 2008). My original research interest was in tourism in Finnmark and its relations to environment(s). The wider context would be climate change’s consequences for Arctic tourism. I got off a boat to what became my empirical context in July 2018. Arriving on the island, I reacted to my surroundings at once. I could taste sea-oxygen in the air. Later, I often found the air quality here breath-taking. My original research aims changed with my change in environment. Crossing the sea from the Norwegian mainland to the island gave me some new perspective. Something in the atmosphere, here, struck a chord with me. I considered developing a new research project, based on my intuitions. Rather than several businesses, the place where I stayed on the island became my unit of analysis. What my research focus would be remained unclear. However, since that research was exploratory, an unclear focus did not really bother me. I saw using a single unit of analysis would involve a case study.

I thought the owners of where I stayed would make interesting informants. I also saw that we had things in common. We were all baby boomers (i.e., all born between the early and mid-1960s). We all had varied experience and backgrounds. My main informant had a dual Sami-Norwegian identity. He had travelled, widely, outside Norway. My female informant was a Filipino-Canadian, living in the Arctic. The couple met in Mexico. I have two passports and have taught English across Europe, Asia and the Middle East.
However, to think informants and I shared a world view would, clearly, be a mistake. No matter what direction my research took, I would aim to present any informants’ case in its own terms (ibid. 16). That is, in terms of how they saw the world; not my own interests, or what we had in common. For now, I would observe, and reflect on my understandings. In this way, my aim, from the start, was to describe, explain and try to understand this object of study reflexively.

Alvesson and Skoldberg describe reflexivity as ‘ways of seeing which act back on, and reflect, existing ways of seeing’ (2009, 271). Reflectivity is about ‘the interpretation of interpretation’ (ibid. 9). That is: reflexivity seeks to understand what understandings are. Reflexivity assesses relations between knowledge, and how knowledge is ‘done’. Its interpretations and reflections should consider ‘perceptual, cognitive, theoretical, linguistic, (inter)textual, political and cultural circumstances’ (ibid). Empirical material, and knowledge claims, should be viewed with scepticism.

Alvesson (2003, 24) states, in reflexive social science, interpretations are challenged, and alternatives considered. Throughout my research, I was aware any of my interpretations would be contingent (that is: subject to chance, or unseen effects). I was also conscious that definite conclusions would be impossible. However, my aims remained to raise questions suggested by the empirical context, and to consider them reflexively, Foley (op. cit.) suggests, through constant self-mirroring, one becomes reflexive about the nature of the self and, by extension, the ‘other’. Looking back on the research potential I saw on my first day here, I thought how closely the emotional and personal can be in ‘intellectual endeavour’ (Okley, 1975; Okely and Callaway, 1992, 9). I also considered how self-consciousness is one way we test our perceptions of what we study (Cohen, 1992, 223). I have, therefore, considered my understanding of my ‘situatedness’ relative to informants, and their context. My ‘race’, nationality, gender, age and personal history will, almost certainly, have affected the research, its interactions, and data collected.

I presented myself to informants as Irish. This is how I mostly self-identify. When I said I grew up in Belfast, my main informant recalled seeing TV news of civil conflict from the city in the 1970s. This has happened to me with people of many nationalities. I often wonder, if my background is seen as turbulent, are people more understanding of me than they might be in other circumstances. Preconceptions on my background, often, lead to instant rapport with people I have just met. In the current case, I found a good basis to proceed my host-stroke-informant.
In reflexive research, researchers need to consider who they are. Also, to consider if that question can ever, really, be answered. Crick (1992, 173) describes, well, the doubts that asking ‘who we are’ can create. Part of the uncertainty comes from working out how to describe ourselves.

I wondered how my hosts (later, informants) saw me. They might have seen a foreign tourist, or a graduate student, or an outsider. Later, when I talked to my main informant about our location’s remoteness, he said: “Remote? But the world visits us.” That world included me. I had to consider if my informants’ view of my ‘outsider’ status might inhibit their responses. I also thought it possible their responses might try to stress the positive. People showing themselves in the best light would be understandable. However, what informants and I had in common might, just as likely, make them less inhibited. In fact, my main informant, later, talked openly about the conflict tourism presented him. In this way, he may have given me a fuller picture than would have emerged, if I’d only heard the positive. I was sure looking for ‘the full picture’ was not a good idea, anyway. Any picture I have described in this study is incomplete and tries to reflect ‘simplicity and rigour’ (Silverman, 135). I have, also, tried to see informants from different perspectives (Alvesson, 2003, 25). In moving along different lines of interpretation, I attempt to avoid privileging any ‘favoured angles’ (ibid.).

Robson (2011, 318) suggests, in exploratory study, the driving force behind observation is the research question. Field observations helped me clarify my research question. They also gave me freedom in what I noticed, and how I recorded. My research question developed through my interaction with informants. It also changed, quite radically, several times. My hope was, in challenging my interpretations, my final research question would lead to more informed and sophisticated understandings. It remains to be said: an exploratory approach would involve the synthesis, abstraction and organisation of research data (Robson, ibid.).

I recalled Guba and Lincoln’s stating empirical findings can be created as research proceeds as my research developed. However, I knew that any intuition I had about the value of the empirical context, and research object, would not be open to practical analysis. Intuition did, however, give me grounds for reflection. Since description often precedes reflection, I began a descriptive journal on my first day here. I saw the journal form as a good way to record a research process, without reaching easy conclusions. The form might open up an interpretative-reflexive research approach to my research. It might, also, give my research breadth of range, richnes of texture and depth of tone.
Alvesson and Skoldberg (2009, 273) suggest that reflexive interpretation has several levels. These include researcher interaction with empirical material, interpretation of meanings, critical interpretation, and reflection on text production. In this spirit, I would try to avoid privileging my own ‘voice’ in field notes. I would impose no ‘delimiting structure’ or a ‘reductive framework’ on data (Denzin; cited in Hollinshead and Jamal, 2007, 93). That is, I would try to avoid fitting observations into a restrictive interpretative frame. Some of my journal entries are referenced in the Data Analysis chapter.

I stayed for three days on my first trip to the island. I had already covered around 1700 kilometres in my rental car. I was happy to take a break from the road. During my stay, I often found myself talking to my main informant at his store’s ‘long table’. This was where he always seemed most at ease. We struck up quite a good rapport, and he seemed happy to talk. I would also walk around, making observations.

For now, I was describing first impressions. I would not evaluate anything I saw critically, let alone think about making prescriptions (Hammersley and Gomm, 2011, 4). Later, my journal turned into the field notes for my research. Eventually, the journal would include spontaneous writing, a variety of descriptions, interview data transcription, and basic analysis. In this way, I used a flexible research design. Robson (ibid. 135) suggests this approach does not involve ‘hard and fast routinised procedures’ (ibid.). Skills required in flexible design include adaptiveness and flexibility; the ability to grasp issues, and a lack of bias (ibid. 134). I welcomed the prospect of developing my research approach as I went along. I would consider my skills reflexively, both during and following my time in the field.

One problem with field notes is the researcher can get ‘stuck’ with the form the notes are first made in (Silverman, 2010, 210). Another is that field notes’ readers only have access to what is recorded, and how. Readers miss much of data’s context. Field notes must, also, be seen in terms of the validity of what they record. If they do not support how an empirical context is described, qualitative researchers should question the internal validity of their work (Schofield, 73). Again, in making field notes, one is not only recording data, but analysing them (ibid.). Any categories that field notes construct will be ‘theoretically saturated’ (ibid.). To date, the only reader of my field notes has been myself. My journal’s evolution - from spontaneous writing and description, to the transcription of interview data and basic analysis - served a number of purposes. One was to avoid what I observed, or wrote, appearing so superficial, or unreflexive, it became invalid. In developing my journal, I seldom felt ‘stuck’. Another purpose was to record data in
longhand, as opposed to on computers. Longhand has the virtue of being identifiably chronological. That is, it does not involve the constant editing, cutting, pasting, deleting, erasing and so on that computer writing involves. I find computerised writing, in itself, may miss as much as it records. The point is: I think a written journal preserves some of the ‘integrity’ of what it records. The relation between theory and analysis Silverman views as problematic is considered later in the thesis. I have thought about how empirical data and theory relate to research analysis from the start of my research. However, I have seen how data are recorded does, indeed, have implications for research’s validity.

Guba and Lincoln (ibid. 6) consider how theory shapes the objects of study. Throughout this study, I remained aware research phenomena can affect one another. I have, therefore, considered how informants and I were linked, interactively. I have also thought about how my data interpretations are value mediated; and, so, value dependent. Values being subjective, I have tried to be aware of the role of my own subjectivity in this research. The authors also suggest interviewer-interviewee relations are important, in terms of social constructions. The authors suggest individual constructions can be elicited, and refined, only through ‘interaction between, and among, investigator and respondents. Further, and as stated: since researcher and research object(s) are interactively linked, empirical findings can be ‘literally created as the investigation proceeds. Again: the final aim of research is to ‘distill’ a consensus construction more informed, and sophisticated, than previous constructions. To distill consensus, I was still working on my relationship with my hosts / informants. I had told them the island seemed a place ‘apart’ to me. It produced positive feelings and associations. I had also spoken of my interest in tourism’s integrating cultures, traditions and beliefs. My main informant was a seventh generation Sámi landowner. Before I left the island, we agreed to work together on a research project. In this way, this informant’s cultural background, and my own interests, came together in my developing research question. In dealing with thresholds in tourism, and in focusing on phenomena in context (Robson, 136), that question implies the boundaries between culture and tourism that were problematic for my main informant.

I tried not to be judgemental when talking to informants. This was important, since my main informant stressed ‘doing the right thing’ in tourism terms. I certainly never considered contradicting any views I heard (Hammersley and Gomm, 2011, 4). I was humbled by my surroundings, and a newcomer to Finnmark. I had seen international visitors might be unaware of this part of Norway’s history or geography. I was thinking
of what happened in Finnmark during World War Two. I was, certainly, one of the ‘unaware’. During my research, I did become aware of the naivety of some of my assumptions about this northern ‘periphery’. For instance: I was surprised to find my main informant did not speak Sámi. My assumption was, every Sámi spoke the language. I became more fully aware of this naivety as my research proceeded. I was also aware of the risk I was exoticising - if not ‘othering’ - my location, and informants. I remain aware that processes of discovery are ongoing. I have considered how my understandings of ‘peripheries’, and ‘remoteness’, developed and changed during research. I have also considered how I was not only an outsider in the research context, but a particular outsider. As someone who has lived, studied and worked abroad most of my life, I am (somewhat) cosmopolitan. Home was once Ireland’s north-east, but most of my professional life has been elsewhere. I speak a couple of languages passably well. I hold dual citizenship.

4.3 Case Studies

Robson (2011, 135) describes the ‘case’ as the situation, individual, group, organisation or ‘whatever it is we are interested in’. ‘Case study’ is seldom used in a clear, or fixed, sense (ibid. 3). The term, generally, refers to research that considers ‘a few cases (often just one) in considerable depth’ (ibid.). The term has implications for data collected, and data analysis. Case studies, often, result in unstructured data and qualitative analysis (ibid. 3-4). Further: case studies often aim to capture cases in their uniqueness, rather than for generalisation, or theoretical inference (ibid.). Features of qualitative research include findings being presented in non-numerical from; ideas and concepts emerging from data; a focus on meanings and contexts; a flexible research design; a lack of concern with generalisability, and the social world being seen as a ‘creation of the people involved’ (ibid, 19).

This research only includes figures relating to demographic, or tourism volume, data. Ideas that emerged from the empirical context developed, and were adjusted, as I went along. My approach considered data’s meanings as open and equivocal. From the start, my research tried to stress informants’ perspective and actions. I was, certainly, interested in how they created their social world(s). I have tried to describe my own constructions in ways that make them ‘visible’ in the research (ibid. 8). This is reflected in the interpretive side of my data analysis.

While this research seeks no basis for generalisation, it does focus on a single tourism site, where the meaning(s) of informants’ world(s) can be contested, relativised
and problematised. I describe this single case in some detail in my data analysis. I also consider patterns I observed in the empirical context (Schofield, 71). However, ‘realised patterns’ must be understood in terms of negation (that is, of contradictory evidence: Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009, 144). Any patterns I describe are open to further analysis.

Becker (222) describes the problem of what can be said about research findings. I have considered whether what I say in this case study is valid, or useful, or relevant. However, my research does not seek to create any objective, or useful, ‘truth’. Rather: it considers questions raised by the empirical context. Its main purpose is exploratory. While I had some general ideas about what I was looking for, my approach remained highly flexible throughout (Robson, ibid. 139). This approach has been informed by A&S’s suggestion (144) that researchers’ critical interpretation is ‘open-ended and fallibilistic’ (Morrow, 1994; cited ibid). That is: interpretation should be adaptable to change and should consider absolute empirical knowledge as impossible. In this sense, my interpretations have been informed, neither by formulaic solutions, nor by rigid reference frames.

Some of the ideas that directed my attention in research were based on what I read at the time. I cannot be sure exactly how my reading influenced fieldwork. The tourism theory I read was all good background material, but not exactly bedtime reading. However, that reading included a compendium on the Philosophy of Social Science. Recently, I noticed how heavily some chapters had been notated, highlighted and underlined (Guba and Lincoln on paradigms; Alvesson on a reflexive approach to interviews; Alvesson Skoldberg on Reflexive Methodology). I had also brought my copy of Bruner’s Culture on Tour and Park to the field. On its cover, the book is described as examining tourist sites ‘in all their particularity’ and considering the ‘multiple perspectives of various actors’. This all seemed very relevant. However, I later wondered how my research might have differed had I been re-reading Anna Karenina, to relax.

Most qualitative studies are based on asking questions, or making field observations (Silverman, 2010, 189). Robson (ibid. 279) suggests interview results should be understood as products of the interview situation and its contingencies. Results cannot be understood as ‘unmediated expressions’ of informants’ opinions (ibid.). Further: a case study can employ interviews to complement observation, or other methods (ibid.). In this way, I started preparing for my case study by observing, and asking questions, but not interviewing (as such). This went on intermittently over three days. More structured interviews came during my second visit to the island. There were five of these, each lasting
between one and two hours. All took place in the informant’s store. Subsequent, interviews were done by phone. There has been half a dozen of these. None lasted less than thirty minutes. My observations might include my sitting alone in the store and simply watching operations there; or my accompanying my main informant as he worked outdoors; or my observing informants without being noticed. Sometimes, we interacted directly, and I observed the context in which we were together. At other times, I was more or less invisible to informants.

On my first visit to the island, I stayed for three days. I was happy to take a break from driving, and often found myself talking to my main informant at his store’s ‘long table’. The table was where he seemed most at ease. Since we had a good rapport, my informant was happy to talk to me. I would also walk around my immediate surroundings and make observations.

Robson (2011, 315) contrasts direct observation with controlled observation. Direct observation is carried out by the ‘human observer’ (ibid.). It can be used to support data obtained by other means (ibid. 317). The author describes data as the observer’s interpretations of what is going on. The observer ‘is the research instrument’ (emphasis in original; 320). Data from direct observation can complement data obtained by virtually any other technique (ibid. 316). At the level of method or technique, this points to flexible design as a useful research strategy.

Most of my interactions with informants were conversational in tone. Hence, data gathered during my first stay that July were quite informal. During my second, more focused visit, we would sit down and talk at least twice a day. My approach, each morning, was based on my reflections on data from the previous day. Each afternoon or evening, we would then sit down again, and talk in light of my reflections on the morning’s work. My aim was to put informants at ease at all times, and allow them to talk informally, at whatever length they chose. My main informant was a fluent talker. As he spoke, I might interrupt and ask questions. However, I saw a balance should be struck between what was interesting to informants, and what was interesting to me. In striking this balance, the tone of interviews varied from friendly and conversational, where informants ‘led the dance’, to more rigorous scrutiny involving direct questions. My female correspondent, generally, stayed somewhat in the background. I would talk to her informally each time I came to the store. Then, we might spend a quarter of an hour in casual conversation. This happened four of five times. My main interview with her was formally scheduled. We spoke for around ninety minutes at the long table. I have since communicated with her be e-
mail. She was never less than co-operative, involved, insightful and informative. As stated, I made a point of speaking to informants as a couple. This was our most in-depth interview.

As stated, main interviews took place during my second visit to the island. All face-to-face interviews were scheduled around informants’ availability. Interviews were sometimes postponed because informants were not free. Sometimes, they were called away, and I had to adjust my schedule. This rather informal pattern was designed to allow informants to ‘set the pace’ (Silverman, ibid. 194). While I brought my own ideas to interviews, none were fixed. I wanted to know, in a general way, what tourism meant to my informants, and how they related to their environment. I was also interested in any challenges they faced. However, I knew this area would have to approached tactfully, rather than seeming part of an agenda. In any case, I had no set questions. Rather, I brought general ideas of what we might talk about. At no time was informants’ straying from ideas I brought up an issue for me. In fact, some of my most interesting findings were unexpected, and created on the spot. For example: I asked informants, at one point, about their tourism and its relations with environment. I had really only wanted to see if my questions made sense, and to measure their responsiveness. I would develop this line of questioning on that basis. However, somehow, we seemed not to get far with this approach. Shortly after, I sketched out a new set of ideas. These focused, much more specifically, on the meaning’s tourism had for informants. On the next occasion, I spoke to informants together, rather than separately. Immediately, things started making more sense, and I observed quite a different range of responses. I noticed my main informant was smiling as his wife spoke. It seemed possible she had never been asked to talk about her in-laws’ culture and heritage to an outsider. This turned out to be one of out most informative encounters.

One advantage of a flexible approach is that questions can be put aside, or changed, and new ones improvised. Robson (op. cit., 324) suggests researchers using this approach are less likely to have ‘set piece interviews’ than ‘on the wing’ discussions. In this spirit, I used an in-depth semi-structured / non-structured interviewing style (Silverman, 195). While informed by a loose interview guide, these semi-structured interviews were based on interviews’ ‘flow’ (Robson, 280). Unplanned questions arose from what informants said. These unstructured interviews allowed our interactions to develop from a general area of interest and were largely informal. This approach felt appropriate to me since, from the start, our interactions were relaxed and non-formal. The approach was
meant to put informants at ease. Eventually, I also began to feel slightly more confident with this style of research.

Answers to open-ended questions can be difficult to analyse. Despite this, the most interesting aspect of my research turned out to be precisely the unexpected answers produced by open questions. For example, talking about environment(s) led my main informant to describe his status as a shaman, and his general indigenous knowledge. This was something I could not have anticipated. What I had heard then become central to my research, in terms of what was thought acceptable in my informants’ tourism practice. I see these responses as among the most valuable data I collected.

This research’s time frame extends from my first visit to the island in 2018, until early this May, when I last spoke to my main informant by phone. Practical constraints meant I could make only two visits to the island. A third trip was cancelled due to bad weather. I then conducted half a dozen telephone interviews with my main informant. My first visit to the island was spontaneous, my second was scheduled. This second visit came once informants had formally consented to assist in my research. All phone calls were preceded by an e-mail agreeing a convenient time.

I have tried to strike a balance between data gathering and a full data analysis, in terms of meeting my research’s deadline. I am aware the course of face-to-face interviews might have been different, if carried out at other times of the year (e.g., mid-winter). However, when I first spoke to informants last July, days were long, and they were enjoying another successful season. Everyone was in good humour. In October, when business was quieter, informants had more time to talk.

I used interview transcriptions as part of my field notes. Interviews were designed to elicit informants’ responses to my developing research question. To avoid their awareness of my interests influencing informants’ responses, I never put my research ideas directly to informants as such. One reason was that the question has only recently been finalised. Interviews were informal and written up shortly afterwards. I planned to elicit certain responses a second time, then record them. Silverman (ibid. 210) states audio or visual recording allows researchers to replay data ‘uncontaminated by assumptions made at the time of recording’. However, while I was never without my recording device, I saw its visibility made informants uncomfortable. I did not want them to feel inhibited by my use of technology. My aim was to encourage cooperation and rapport. Therefore, I mostly used shorthand to record what I heard (I learned shorthand as a trainee journalist). Ultimately, I felt this decision may have produced richer responses.
Robson (2011, 321) suggests one problem for observation in research is how much information is available to researchers. In writing observations up, records must be made shortly after observation. Observers need to ensure their records are understandable and say what they mean to say. My data transcription was done each evening, when I spent several hours putting data into writing. I am aware there can be no perfect transcription. I therefore used my own past experience, and common-sense reasoning, to give an adequate reflection of my analytic purposes in data transcription (Silverman, 212).

I remained aware of the limitations of this study throughout. However, this awareness was informed, and qualified, by Foley’s suggestion ‘quasi-objective knowledge claims’ may emerge from a reflexive, self-critical awareness of researchers’ limits as interpreters (473). This research takes a self-critical, sceptical, open-ended approach. I have tried to be reflexively aware of its strengths and weaknesses; my own preconceptions, and possible biases I brought to it. Throughout, I have tried to consider my own personal qualities honestly, critically, and in ways that challenge my understandings.

4.4 Ethical Considerations

This study had been notified to and approved by the Data Protection Official for Research, NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (Project 61167). Informants were aware of the institution responsible for the project (UiT), and the project’s supervisor (BG). I complied with NSD’s template for asking for informed consent when processing personal data. My formal invitation to informants outlined what participation would involve, what they were being asked to consent to, and what consequences participation in the research be (see appendix 1). Informants told me they would be happy to assist in my research *. However, they were informed of their right to send any complaints they may have to NSD’s Data Protection Officer or The Norwegian Data Protection Authority. Informants’ participation has been voluntary. They have been made aware they are free to withdraw their consent to participate, without giving a reason, at any time. Conditions of confidentiality have been described to informants, and all their personal data have remained anonymous in this thesis. Participants have only been directly identifiable to me, and the project supervisor. It remains to be said, informants were put under close scrutiny in the research, and will probably be easily recognisable to anyone familiar with tourism in this region who reads it. The ethical implications of this recognition are potentially profound. I have no hesitation in admitting I have no easy means of dealing with this difficulty.
As the research was being finalised, I sent a complete draft to informants, and asked if they were unhappy with how they had been represented. Their response was positive and allowed me to make clarifications. For example: I found out more about how the business developed with the help of an Estonian partner, and how Hammerfest Municipality expressed their appreciation of informants’ taking responsibility for visitors to the island. Indeed, our last conversation gave me new data I do not have time to incorporate in this thesis. All data have been, or will be, processed according to the UiT’s internal guidelines for information security. Informants are aware research data may be stored after the project is completed for the purpose of follow-up studies.

I have had to consider the ethical meaning of research that brought me so close to my informants. I am aware this closeness has brought me right to the edge of what may or what not be morally acceptable or correct. In a strange way, this conflicted awareness is not unlike that of my main informant relative to the acceptable and unacceptable. I have therefore remained particularly mindful that informants and data are handled ethically. However, I remained aware high involvement with informants may compromise a researcher’s role (Robson, 317). In this respect, my training in journalism helped preserve professional distance. As with my recording what informants said in shorthand, my professional background played a role in this research. Some of that background’s requirements include an open and enquiring mind, being a reasonably good listener, and a general sensitivity to contradictory evidence (ibid. 133-4).

With this in mind, I spoke to my main informant shortly before my thesis was finalised. I was very much relieved to hear they thought how I described them was ‘all O.K.’ That final consent was so crucial, but came so late in this research process, it shocked me to think what might have happened had informants’ consent been withdrawn at the last minute. I think it is true to say, the last day we talked was the best day I had throughout the entire research process. I eventually asked myself if they had not only assisted my research but also co-created it (Ren). Co-creation would have clear implications for research practices and knowledge production as well as the ethical challenges researchers face in using co-creation in tourism research. This is considered in my conclusion.

Tourism situations and activity will have multiple meanings for research. Hammersley and Gomm (2011, 7) challenge the idea people have unitary perspectives available for empirical study. In this light, I adopted an interpretative approach in analysing empirical data. This approach would be critical, and consider subjectivity, meaning, emotion and
reason. An appreciation of understandings would be a core concept in my approach. In this sense, I would be exploring people’s subjective, or intersubjective, experiential worlds (meanings) (Alvesson and Skjöldberg, 2009) (1). The empirical context would be developed, and my understanding adjusted and refined, as I went along. Interpretation was strengthened by new observations.

Since I had relatively little time for interviews, every exploratory resource available to me became important. Observation supported and supplemented data collection. It allowed me to form a ‘rough definition of the phenomenon of interest’ (326). That is, it meant I could be analytical, continually, in working out what kind of question(s) my research should address. Observation allowed me to review, repeatedly, my research question in light of what I observed. Robson identifies one problem with observation as the separation of data collection and analysis phases (ibid. 320). Again, there is a major issue concerning how observers affect what is observed (ibid. 316). Logically, we cannot know how observed behaviour might have been, if not observed. In my own case, I saw combining ‘phases’ as an opportunity. Some of my analysis took place during data collection. Shifting interpretations shaped my research’s development, continually. This was something I felt quite comfortable with. One feature of journalism is ‘thinking on one’s feet’. A general sensitivity to what one observes can also involve thinking on several levels simultaneously.

There is one further reason why observation was important in this research. In a single case study with only two informants, it was important for me to get to know informants as well as I could. The more I observed them, the better we knew each other.
5. Analysis

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of empirical data. In terms of the research question, concepts described have enabled a degree of critical analysis, and may make new tourism understandings available (Salazar, 2010, 17) The research question explores how aspects of non-tourism identity now excluded from tourism practice might be included in future, if given new meaning(s). I have arrived at this question in the understanding it may open up complex layers in the relations between tourism and identity. Concept of place identity, here, is seen as being constructed from understandings of the present, in combination with past understandings imposed on current knowledge and understanding (Simm and Marvell 2016). This understanding has informed the research question. Bærenholdt et als’ suggestion (2004) that tourist places may be eroded, overlain by new sedimented practices, or reconstructed at a later time, has also been instrumental in arriving at the research question.

In the empirical context, I have seen how the categorisation of ‘identity’ is problematic, and can be further problematised. Given these observations, I go on to consider how categories exist in relation to one another, rather than independently. I then consider how categories seen by respondents as independent might be related; and how they might then be seen as mutual, rather than exclusive. In this respect, I consider whether apparently independent categories may be re-understood in ways that reflect an ‘inseparable unity of the material and the social’ (Abram and Lien, 2011, 4). This consideration is also addressed to non-material phenomena (i.e., indigenous beliefs).

One feature of the empirical context is the contradiction the main respondent sees between the touristic and non-touristic. In this sense, what is and is not acceptable in tourism practice represents a conflict for the respondent. What is of interest here to me is how touristic and non-touristic categories are ‘produced and reproduced’ (Abram and Lien, 2011). The respondent is happy to acknowledge that non-touristic potential will, probably, be realised in future tourism practice. I have therefore considered how the categories constructed might be ‘reproduced’ in a new tourism narrative, but sooner rather than later.

The distinctions the respondent made between tourism and non-tourism identity gave me a categorical structure for the research’s direction. I would take what the respondent later told me was ‘forbidden’ in his tourism practice as non-touristic. The ‘forbidden’ referred to a religious (i.e., non-material) Sami belief and associated practices
that the respondent said tourism would “destroy” (see …). It also referred to a cave that is part of the respondent’s family history. Tourists had asked to hear more about this cave, but the respondent considered its story off-limits in tourism. In contrast, tourism services, products and facilities would be considered as touristic. In this context, I began to develop and explore my research question.

Paulgaard (2008, 59) suggests we create meanings within a ‘previously structured universe of meaning’ that defines ‘what is acceptable and what is not’. Hence, the research considers whether current tourism practice might be a site for knowledge and belief now excluded from it; and how what is now ‘unacceptable’ might be re-considered.

When they appear, inconsistencies in data have been noted. I believe that identifying an absence of consistency in data is as interesting as finding patterns in them. Such a lack of consistency may illustrate how the world is not as neatly structured as established categories suggest.

Wright and Nyberg (139) suggest that identities are ‘dialogical and situational’. Salazar (2010, xvi) recommends consideration of ‘the manifold ways in which discourses and practices of local-global processes intersect, overlap and clash’ (my emphasis). Conflicting aspects of tourism and identity’s ‘manifold’ inter-reactions have shed light on the research question. Further, in this respect, the research has been informed by the possibility there is ‘no possibility of fixed, final, or singular authoritative meanings [to things] and that ‘there is only interpretation . . . nothing speaks for itself, anywhere’ (Denzin, 1994: cited in Hollinshead and Jamal 2007, 89). Further consideration is given in the methodology chapter.

In section 2, I describe the empirical context. I introduce research subjects and consider thresholds between tourism and non-tourism worlds in their practice. The meaning(s) of binary distinctions are considered relative to the production of (non)tourism categories. Salazar’s ‘meaning production’ is considered relative to meanings that are now seen as incompatible with tourism practice. This ties in with the theory chapter’s consideration of meaning(s): imaginaries and inscriptions. The display of Sámi heritage is considered relative to commoditisation and its potential distortions in tourism.
5.2 The island: the location

The empirical context for this research is a tourism business operating on an island off the north-east coast of Finnmark. People have lived there for over 7000 years, and traces of previous generations’s traces remain visible throughout the island. Finnmark’s population is around 70,000. 84 residents of the location where my research subjects live were entitled to vote in municipal council and county council elections in 2007 (Statistics Norway).

Much of the island’s terrain is made up of meadows, forests, mountains and fjords. Large areas are covered in bare rock with little or no debris. Ultrabasic bedrock gives rise, in parts, to lush plant life. In most parts of the island, however, bedrock is covered in landslide and moraine debris. The island’s highest peak is 1079 meters above sea level.

The island is popular with geologists and rock collectors. Due to its ultrabasic bedrock, it has been the site of exploration for industrial minerals. Its steep, bare rock-faced mountains are home to birds of prey, including merlin, eagles, buzzards and kestrels. Grouse and hare can be hunted in the island’s National Park with a permit (ibid.).

I drove around north Finnmark in July 2018. As I drove up and down the surrounding coast, I was charmed by the island’s profile. Various perspectives of the island are available from the costal road that runs parallel to it. All of these struck me as wonderful. From the mainland, there is no sign of human habitation on the island. Its total population is below 250. I decided to go there a few days later.

My destination was located 19 km from the island’s northernmost ferry point. I was greeted at my destination by the business’s owner. I had come without a booking in the hope of finding a place to stay. This was not a good idea in high season, but I was in luck. I had barely looked at the business’s homepage till now. When I later did, I read that anyone can meet at my destination’s village store to ‘catch up on news, conclude business agreements, get acquainted with the local population or just act, if that’s what they want to do’ (the tourism business homepage).

After a while, I came to see the store as the heart of the business, if not this part of the island. One conspicuous feature of the store was its ‘long table’. Neither table nor store were ever described to me as ‘the heart’ of anything. However, the table was where new arrivals were encouraged to sit down and have a chat. Here, they got an introduction to the island from their hosts and were made to feel welcome. Guests came to the store if
they had questions. They called up the stairs leading to where the owners lived if no-one was about (I had to do this several times in my first hour). I saw that the threshold between tourism and non-tourism worlds was, literally, a threshold here.

On weekdays, the store is open for four hours mornings (10.00 - 14.00) and two hours evenings (17.00 - 19.00). On Saturdays, it is open for five hours (10.00 - 15.00). It is closed on Sundays, but opening hours are flexible in high season.

A lady who introduced herself as a former member of both Norwegian and Sámi Parliaments later told me, on Saturdays, a local Parliament met at the long table to discuss community issues. Her involvement in politics gave her use of the word ‘Parliament’ weight. The term seemed carefully chosen. It chimed with the store’s open atmosphere. She was one of several serious and articulate people I met at the location. These included my hosts.

As I waited to check in, I walked round the store. It was certainly well appointed. Besides groceries and beers, I noticed lottery tickets, maps, petrol and marine diesel, handicrafts, fishing tackle and medical supplies were on sale. I also explored the store’s small museum, which includes written and audio-visual information, historical artefacts and souvenirs. The island’s gákti on display. The gákti is an item of traditional Sámi clothing - a personalised outfit saying a lot about its owner. It illustrates where its owner comes from; their genealogy; their marital status, and whether or not they celebrated their confirmation. Each gákti is hand-made (Fonneland, 77).

When I asked if I could buy the Sámi boots also on display, I was told unfortunately, they were not for sale. I later questioned what might be knee-jerk tourist impulse - to buy something. Few tourists come home without something to show (Graborn, 33). I later thought this ‘visual expression of identity’ (Park, 95) might have been cued to tell that some things have more than commercial value. Perhaps, even, that they remained ‘inalienable’ (Kramvig, 2005, 46). This seemed to challenge Cohen’s view of local culture serving as the principal example of commoditisation, and description of culture as a touristic product (372). I thought these items not being for sale suggested an authentic meaning was being preserved (authentic, in Cohen’s sense: quote) Tourism had not ‘intervened’ in the definition of these identity markers (Lanfant et al.) For the moment, I concluded that my impulse to buy was both unthinking and unreflexive (more to follow).

My host and I drank coffee at the long table. I noticed it was covered in invitations to events at the store. I then discovered the Finnmark Dagblad I had picked up was on
sale daily here. During my second visit to the island (though not my first) internet reception was perfect. The first discovery was reassuring. Besides suggesting a connection with the ‘outside’ world, newspapers remind me of my time in journalism. The quality of internet connections at the location did not worry me. I can live without instant connectivity. This was the summer, and I was free. However, I became aware the instant on-line connections many take for granted could not be taken for granted here. This raised questions of places that may be seen as peripheral relative to ‘the centre’. Nevertheless, when I brought this question up later, the male respondent told me his life here was ‘100% normal’. His statement seemed to challenge my preconceptions on peripheral exceptionalism. That is to say, my thinking life on the ‘periphery’ must be harder than living somewhere else (references to follow). I thought it marked a significant distinction between local and outside worlds and their respective perceptions: the environment’s ‘relational effects’ (Viken).

When I was introduced to my host’s wife, I told her I used to be a teacher. She told me one local school had closed due to reduced pupil numbers. In the museum, I watched a film where a Norwegian teacher talked about coming to the island to work. This teacher wondered what he had got himself into. Phone coverage disappeared on his arrival. This made him ‘nervous’. He described the island’s landscape as ‘barren’ (my translations). This contrasted with my first impressions. I saw the perspective of someone who is not a tourist may well differ from someone who is. I also imagined the Norwegian teacher had arrived on the island with very different expectations, and probably not in summer. It then occurred to me that most of my perceptions of the place so far had been ‘touristic’.

My female host described the island further in terms of development and decline. There used to be fifteen fishing boats working from the local fjord. There are far fewer now. Over two hundred people once lived on the fjord. The number is now around seventy. I would see only a handful of industrial boats at the location during this visit. Most of the boats I saw were for tourism use. However, as the lady said, fishing tourism was essential to the business’s success. She also said the tourism business’s bookings had gone up annually since the National Park was named in 2006. This brought home to me the resilience of tourism in the face of local population decline, and in light of changing economic circumstances that may dictate moves toward more populous centres (reference). It also recalled coherence between … A&L. In my preconceived view, most of the traffic is one way. The respondent would later give an example that suggested centres can
lag behind (section). This would give me a potential illustration of how a currently non-touristic feature might be used to attract tourists to our location.

5.3 Research subjects

The male respondent is a Sámi native of the island and a 53-year-old grandfather. The Saami people are the only indigenous people in Northern Europe (Kramvig, 2005, 46). The land he co-owns at the location has been in his family for seven generations. He is the only direct family descendant living permanently on the island. Born on the island in the 1960s, he in his second marriage to the female respondent, a Canadian with Filipino heritage. The couple met in Mexico, when he was in higher education, and she was working in a Canadian bank. The female respondent is in her fifties. The family live above the village store with their young son. They run the tourism business as a couple. Most of my research questions were addressed to the male respondent. At once, I saw this fluent English speaker enjoyed an audience. He seemed a natural storyteller. Past and present were woven together as he spoke. For instance: describing the pros and cons of tourism’s high season (business: being too busy), he might start talking about the island in the Second World War. I later saw this story telling ability might be used to reproduce categories (section…) particularly with reference to bringing the past to bear.

How he talked suggested talking was part of his tourism competence (more). I later saw how competence could be used to reproduce categories. Taking on unscheduled tasks was also part of what he did. While greeting me and answering my questions on day one, he was also having documents signed by a fishing party and hosting several locals. I saw him run the the location store, do paperwork, transfer bedding, check on electricity repair people from the mainland, unload a fishing boat, receive the local mail, be at the jetty for fishing tourists as they came and went, and move equipment with a truck. These were just things I happened to notice him doing while doing other things myself.

Over coming days, the male respondent struck me as something of an original among tourism actors. Form what he would tell me, I also thought his non-tourism identity might have tourism potential. Nevertheless, he seemed wary of saying too much about that identity. Some things went ‘too deep’ to talk about (‘at least for now’). I found myself admiring the personal morality this difficulty suggested to me. I also found it odd that such a ‘talker’ would ever be lost for words. However, I would hear the phrase ‘do the right thing’ repeatedly in our conversations over coming months. I also often heard about what he described as his ‘conflict’. This was between what could and could not be
used his tourism practice. As stated, this distinction between tourism and non-tourism identity subsequently gave me a categorical structure for the research’s direction.

5.4 A Tourism Business

The business’s homepage says:


The male respondent explained this was once a part-time business. It started taking full bookings in 2007. This development was enabled by an Estonian business partner. When I asked how things stood today, he described eight tourist cabins. Each can accommodate six to eight people, is equipped with every modern appliance, and is suitable for short or longer stays.

I have stayed in one of these cabins (also, in a private house a family aunt occasionally lives in that doubles as accommodation). The first thing I noticed was the wide variety of international rations in my cabin’s kitchen. I guessed some the tourism business’s visitors must be sufficiently well off to leave behind what others might take away. It then occurred to me leaving food behind showed generosity between tourists.

I picked up family memorabilia as I walked around. These included a fishing competition certificate from my male host’s youth. As with the traditional clothing display and the threshold between ‘store’ and ‘home’ I had observed, I saw the boundaries between tourism and non-tourism overlapped here. This was of particular interest to me, in terms of how categories can exist in relation to one another, rather than independently.

I spent some admiring two cabinets filled with sets of beautiful old crockery. These seemed to be quite old family possessions. I was struck by the warmth and intimacy these objects’ inclusion in tourist accommodation suggested to me. Their being here at all showed, again, how close tourism and non-tourism worlds were in this ‘world’. It was noticeable how one non-touristic category (apparently personal belongings) had been reproduced to add texture to a tourism setting (i.e., where tourists boarded). I thought this ‘reproduction’ might be applied in the wider context of creating new tourism products.
and meanings. There were, besides, modern sofas, recliners and coffee tables, and a conference length kitchen table.

5.5 Expressions of Sámi Identity

One important feature of my host’s identity is his self-representation as a Sámi shaman (noaidi). I did not hear about this on my first trip to the island, only once my research was underway. I had never met a shaman and wanted to hear more. However, my respondent told that me shamanism was generally not something he talked about. This recalled his saying that some things went ‘too deep’ to talk about. Nevertheless, he went on to tell me he owned original handwritten documents describing both his father’s and grandfather’s shamanic knowledge. I saw this would make him at least a third generation noaidi. When his father thought the respondent was mature enough (when he was ‘ready’), the respondent was told to write down everything his father said. The process took several days.

What I heard here had given a significant new dimension to a situation I already saw as having many layers, Shamanism opened up the possibility of assumptions about the world that were quite different from my own.

I asked for an example of shamanism in practice. My respondent said he infused locally grown herbs into medicines. He added, if someone was injured or ill on this part of the island, a shamanic remedy was once their first resort. More traditional approaches came later. In the first instance, local residents still came to him today. He would see people at short notice but preferred appointments.

He later told me there was once a Sámi ‘healer’ in every village. When I asked him to say more, he told me ‘people’ still learned ‘from parents’. I already knew the male respondent had a son and a granddaughter. I also knew there more than one child from the couple’s previous relationships. Since the location is the only village on north the island, he seemed to be implying someone in his family was now learning ‘healing’ from him. Knowing his sensitivity on the subject, I said no more. However, it occurred to me the old power of healing was, perhaps, being given new life, and its continuity into the present was now being considered. I thought that a new imaginary might come to ‘enter subjective experience’ here in the expectation the future would, therefore, continue to make sense (Salazar, 2012, 864). Also, of a new tourism imaginary the potential as repository.
My female respondent later told me there was no state doctor available on this part of the island. The nearest doctors worked 25 km away and on the mainland. However, the male respondent can administer conventional general medical care. The store’s large first aid kit indicates this competence.

The male respondent stressed his shamanic knowledge was not used in tourism practice. He believed ‘tourism would destroy it.’ Again, if nature was lost, so would his shamanic knowledge be lost. It was a ‘gift’ that ‘came from nature’. It later struck me this self-imposed ruling amounted to a taboo (that is, something judged unacceptable on grounds of morality). The respondent would confirm this in saying he felt ‘forbidden’ from using shamanism in tourism. It appeared this knowledge was being excluded from tourism markets by quite a rigorous normative prohibition (Cohen, 371).

This fear seemed all the more understandable, given that shamanism reflected ‘pre-modern life prior to the penetration of modern Western influences’ (Cohen, 375). On the other hand, this fear seemed to view change exclusively in terms of a decline that might threaten to ‘rupture the past’ (Hewison, 1987). My female respondent herself had described the island in terms of decline and development. I thought the destructive power of commoditisation might have been overstated in this instance. Tradition in danger of disappearing.

I had seen that the male respondent had a spiritual and emotional place attachment with a long tradition. Aspects of his identity’s meaning derived from personal and family history (Hewison). If only in terms of its length, his heritage seemed worth protecting to me. However, the interpretation of his past posed a dilemma in present terms (his ‘conflict’). The introduction of aspects of his heritage to tourism remained a potential, but potentially compromising, option.

(Lanford et al 1995) state that identity becomes problematic when associated with commoditisation. In response, my male respondent seemed to me to have compartmentalised his identity and was thus keeping heritage’s meaning(s) separate from his tourism practice. My idea of New Age tourists coming to the location in search of esoteric knowledge did not seem to interest him. Nor did the possibility this knowledge being kept from tourism might increase the likelihood of the ‘loss of appreciation of sacred / spiritual ‘things’ by future generations

I had thought that the respondent’s freedom to perform his identity as he chose called into question the universal identity erosion Lanfant et al. put down to globalisation. The repeated emphasis on ‘doing the right thing’ in the empirical context certainly
seemed at odds with the ‘particular capitalist social imaginary’ that informs ‘how we collectively make sense of and act in the world’ (Wright and Nyberg, 2016, 172) see section. I contrasted resistance to this imaginary with the perhaps common belief that every commercial opportunity available to tourism should be exploited. On the other hand, in terms of how the respondent ‘recognised’ himself (De la Barre), his conflict left open the question of whether that identity might, indeed, become ‘obsolete’ or be viewed as ‘inadequate’. The potential loss of (it’s becoming obsolete) would be a serious matter. On the other hand, the shamanism stories I was hearing seemed to affirm identity and pride (De la Barre, 826). I was struck by how the respondent ‘remembered, voiced and lived’ place identity in terms of … (ibid.) I thought his memories had the potential to assume a life-force of their own (Park, 95). Were this the case, these aspects of non-tourism identity currently excluded from tourism practice might be included in future. Their suitability as potential tourism resources might then be reconsidered if they were given alternative meanings.

I later considered Graburn’s observation that modern tourism ‘exemplifies ceremonies and folklore’ as ‘expressive culture’ and ‘diversions from the ordinary’, and that ‘make life worth living’ (21-2). ‘The most minimal kinds of tourism’ contain ‘elements of the magic’ (24). Shamanism has clear magical associations. Again, I thought tourism actors had potential as informed local ‘culture brokers’ (Salazar, 674). The idea of someone with the necessary resources renegotiating the ‘system of meanings that govern a given structure’ Castoriadis (1975). As culture broker, the respondent might translate and interpret between tourism and his knowledge of the natural world. It occurred to me: indigenous knowledge might be reconsidered, not only as time and place specific, but also as something with more widespread application. Simm and Marvell’s ‘layering’ of meaning seemed relevant to me to such development (more).

The male respondent spoke of a ‘New Shamanism’ that goes back to the practice’s roots. However, he said he “did not like” this development. When I asked why, he explained that this new ‘turn’ meant something traditionally passed down between generations one-to-one was now being taught in classrooms. I understood he saw ‘new shamanism’ as a pale imitation of something more authentic, and less procedural. From his perspective, shamanism was not a classroom commodity. Not one of Cohen’s ‘goods’ (380) that was ‘evaluated primarily in terms of their exchange value’. I thought of Cohen’s alleged changes in the meaning of cultural products’ making them ‘meaningless’. The dis-
tinction this episode illustrated was not unlike that between my male respondent’s perceptions of the touristic and non-touristic. This invited consideration of how such binary categories were ‘produced and reproduced’ (Abram & Lien, 2011).

These observations also recalled Kramvig’s view on reclaiming and revitalising traditions in today’s Sápmi (2010, 71). Kramvig states this challenge has been undertaken at the highest political levels. Meeting the challenge involves building institutions and administration in environmental and resource management, culture, education and health. The challenge’s difficulty is also reflected on the ground. Recapturing traditional knowledge involves ‘self-articulation in a turbulent and complex landscape’ (ibid.). (Kramvig goes on to consider how pasts are ‘recognised differently’, and how objects possess different pasts: 72).

My male respondent’s perceptions of what is now his non-tourism identity can be contrasted with Sámi representations at the Isogaisa festival, and the Sápmi Park at Kárásjohka (Karasjok). The festival’s focus is on ‘indigenous cultures and the spiritual’ (Festival homepage). Fonneland (171) describes how the festival markets Sámi shamanism as entertainment and a self-development tool. Shamanism is given virtual representation at Sápmi Park (bookfinnmark.com). Visitors can ‘meet Sámi culture, history and mythology in an engaging, informative and entertaining way’ (ibid.). While these figures are out of date, Olsen (7) states there were 140,000 visitors to ‘so called Sámi attractions’ in 1996.

Some of Bruner’s observations are of interest here. One is that every story can be reinterpreted at a later date and retold in a new context where different meanings emerge (179). Bruner also states the question of what is best for the ‘representative’ needs to be asked (109). Most interestingly (for me): ‘Identities are not given; they are performed by people with agency who have choices’ (109).

These considerations shed light on my research. I had begun to see there was nothing absolute preventing my male respondent from giving his identity new tourism meaning(s). What he did or did not do remained a matter of personal choice. However, I thought of Bruner’s suggestion that ‘old narratives’ form ‘the mainstay of tourism imaginations’ (cited in De la Barre). I saw that inclusion of the cave’s story might become a means of supporting future tourism practice.

Again, however, the business’s tourism ‘mainstays’ (reference) remained a matter of choice. That choice might be questioned from a research or commercial perspective. In
market terms, if a tourism enterprise has a ‘unique selling point’, or something that distinguishes it from competitors, that point will often be emphasised for commercial purposes. To some, the respondent’s reluctance regarding the cave may seem odd. The meanings of place and its use for the respondent were certainly ‘not-so-obvious’ to me (De la Barre 2013, 838). The respondent seemed to be ‘contesting’ and ‘struggling with’ these meanings and uses in his own terms (ibid.). How he understood his ‘place in the world’ was not to be simplified in terms of tourism commodities. Opposition to tourism’s use of ‘simplified and historically fixed versions of local natural and cultural heritage’ (Salazar, 2013) becomes of interest here. As does a resistance to heritage being put ‘on display’ (ibid.) and being adopted and used as tourism commodity. The unacceptability of ‘imagined cultural belonging’ claims staked upon them (ibid.) by Germans who had their own interest in the war narrative.

What did seem clear was that the cultural dynamics, institutions, decision-making processes and value systems (reference) that informed his identity seemed to have produced a configuration at odds with received ideas of what a tourism operator is or should be. On the other hand, to question that reluctance might reflect a failure to ‘recognise the possibility of a radical ontological difference’ (Kramvig, 2019, 65). That is, the possibility of the respondent having fundamentally different assumptions about the nature of the world. To question that reluctance might ‘simply (convert) other ontologies into other cultural perspectives’ (ibid.). That is to say: to consider fundamentally different assumptions reductively and reduce a complex phenomenon to familiar terms. This happens in commoditisation (more). In this sense, the inherent value of the male respondent’s different assumptions might not be acknowledged. As Kramvig suggests: ‘it (is) important to understand differences as other worlds and not as different cultures or perspectives’ (my emphasis).

When I asked the male respondent what he thought of Sápmi Park, he said it was a good idea for ‘Norwegians’ to go there. This seemed consistent with Kramvig’s suggestion many stories ‘need to be told, as well as listened to, by a Norwegian public’ (reference). I found this interesting for other reasons. One was its suggestion tourism can involve learning about one’s own country. Perhaps most interesting was the question of what being Norwegian meant to my male respondent.
5.6 The cave

In World War Two, German forces occupied Denmark and Norway (April 1940). In May that year blitzkrieg or ‘lightning war’ signalled a major German offensive in western Europe. Vidkun Quisling led a pro-Nazi government in Oslo. Norway surrendered to Germany that June (Williams, 524). My male respondent said his family fled the German army in the war and hid in a cave. To me, he seemed to want to talk about this yet not go into detail. The cave’s location is known to few outside his family.

This was during Operation Nordlicht. The destruction was huge and relentless (ibid.). In Finnmark, the Germans left few houses standing. Much of the local population was deported. When northern Norway was rebuilt following the war, Olsen (2009, 40) describes how ‘most places along the coastline resurrected as Norwegian’. Sámi material culture no longer stood out in rebuilt settlements. Sámi culture, seen as ‘belonging to the past’, became ‘hidden’ (ibid.). Cultural artefacts and features that might have been seen as ‘symbols of Sáminess disappeared from social spheres’ (41).

Some German tourists recently asked the male respondent to take them to the cave. He said sorry, but no. While the cave has tourism potential (e.g., paid excursions), he does not want to exploit that potential. For him, this would mean a betrayal of his family’s traditions. This was a clear illustration of how meaning was the product of history, events, discoveries and the experiences of ‘people who came before’ (Steiner and Reisinger, 2006). The respondent was clearly resistant to history and memory being recreated as ‘tourist resources’, and heritage being seen as ‘capital’ or a ‘resource to exploit’ (Cohen (2014). Culture would not be performed, or produced, for touristic consumption (ibid.). What may have been the Germans’ ‘imagined cultural belonging’ claims would not be staked upon them (Salazar, 2013).

However, he remained unconcerned about his son carrying on the family tourism business in a different way. If old ways disappeared, new ways would replace them. The couple’s son would be trusted to ‘do the right thing’. My respondent’s meaning seemed to be his son will be free to use the cave and its narrative as future attractions. I certainly thought the story of the cave would make an attractive tourism narrative. However, when we spoke of future scenarios, the respondent made an important qualification. If a new tourism concern took over the tourism business now, it ‘probably wouldn’t make sense’ to him.
The phrase ‘doing the right thing’ came up repeatedly in our conversations. I thought again about Bruner’s view old narratives are the mainstay of tourism imaginaries. The history of the cave and of shamanism at the location are ‘old narratives. However, rather than ‘mainstays’, they remain firmly in the background of subjects’ tourism practice.

Further points of interest are made in Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel (Bruner, 2005). Bruner identifies one key narrative question as ‘the right to tell the story’ (12). I was in no doubt my male respondent had the ‘right’ to tell his World War Two story and recount the history of local shamanism. His reluctance seemed to confirm Bruner’s view that part of every representation of experience remains ‘untold’ (20). It also seemed to confirm particular narratives might so ‘overwhelming’, their presentation ‘has not yet been developed’ (ibid: my emphasis). His almost physical discomfort in talking about his conflict suggested the ‘narrative structure’ of tourism sites might, indeed, be ‘interpretively intimidating’ (ibid.). However, it was fairly clear to me he would not have thought in these terms.

5.7 Past: present: future

My hostess told me tourism had been the dream of her husband’s father. She showed me a typed letter from 1969. I thought it must have been written by her grandfather father but was wrong. A mainland academic had written to the municipal authorities that year to suggest that trails to the island’s glaciers be marked. This was the original document. The gentleman had been thinking along these lines since 1962. His request was turned down. The debate on developing the National Park for visitors continues. There are still no marked trails in the park. My hostess said there was still no infrastructure at all in the National Park. From her slightly dry tone, I gathered there was a difference between tourism as ‘dream’ and its reality.

The respondents are warm people running what seems a successful tourism business that gets consistently good customer reviews, especially from fishing tourists. There has been an annual increase in their bookings since the National Park opened in 2006. The couple are bringing up a healthy son and live in one of the most spectacular locations I have been. But seemed to me that anyone could see their life here is not a dream.

My male respondent showed me the land he owns on a map. This includes an uninhabited island, whose island-off-an-island tourism potential he may develop. This told me not all future development represents a conflict for him: that one feature of the tourism business without tourism meaning today might be given tourism meaning tomorrow.
What is of interest here to me is how touristic and non-touristic categories seem to be continually ‘produced and reproduced’ (Abram and Lien, 2002). I later learned the tourism business has other options. Corporations send staff to the island on team building exercises. This told me the environment can be framed both as challenge and attraction. It also showed how a non-tourism concept (corporate teambuilding) can influence tourism’s changing perception of natural resources. Other options might take at least another generation to realise. The couple’s son is one obvious candidate for inheritance of their tourism business. There is, however, more than one son from their previous relationships. The male respondent also has a granddaughter.

The male respondent was born in 1966. His father’s tourism dream may have preceded the academic’s suggestion. Every date I heard in our conversations felt important. I began to think about time in tourism. On a geology-rich island, this is a place layered in many senses (literal, metaphorical, semiotic, temporal).

I thought about Marvell and Simm’s palimpsest concept (2016). The concept illustrates how past sense is brought to the present over time. Place identity can be constructed from understandings of the present, in combination with past understandings imposed on current knowledge and understanding. These factors illustrate how, over time, places can acquire multiple meanings. In its showing tourism’s present as an expression of its cumulative past, I saw that taking the concept into account might lead to alternative, more fluid, tourism meaning(s). To me, in its being multi-layered, the palimpsest concept suggests the richness of texture in context. Using the concept in tourism might produce a ‘progressive sense of place’ that is open, multiple, unfinished and ‘always becoming’ (De la Barre, 260).

Doreen Massey’s theory of place will be considered. The notion of a progressive sense of place gained much traction in social and cultural geography as it provided a multi-scalar, relational means to understand the cultural complexity and emergent nature of places, situating locales and communities within globalising processes while not being subjugated to them. To this idea, Massey added the notion of ‘power geometries’ noting that places are made through power relations – not simply capital relations – which construct the rules and define boundaries (Massey, 1993).

Initially, this was articulated through the notion of ‘space-time’ in which space and time are conceived as being inseparable (Massey, 1992b, 1999). Space must be understood as a sphere of multiplicity in which distinct trajectories and heterogeneity co-exist. Space must be acknowledged to be always under construction; always in the process
of being made. Recognised as active and heterogeneous, I went on to consider how the sense we make can always become fixed and resistant to change. What I mean by this is that understandings can be persistently maintained and thus not subject to developing circumstances. This brings to mind the idea that stable meanings enable the management of innovation and decay that change can bring (Hewison 1987, 43-7).

On the other hand, if sense-making is considered in terms of continuous and cumulative activity (as Marvell and Simm’s concept suggests), past understandings that are maintained despite changing circumstances might be reconsidered. If heritage objects, places and practices are seen as symbols that can be removed from their historical context, current meanings can then be put aside, and new associations created (Hewitt, 26-7). If tourism meanings were understood as cumulative and changeable in these terms, a past with potential tourism meaning(s) embedded within it might become available in future. Reconsidering the past might become a ‘means of renegotiating, or even producing new cultural forms’ (Fonneland, 235). Tourism at the tourism business might be ‘overlain by new sedimented practices’ (Bærenholdt et al, 2004)

I began to think ‘uncovering’ the tourism business’s multiple references (see below) had the potential to enrich tourism experience. Tourism also has the potential to ‘transform, articulate, contest and communicate the meaning of evolving cultural identity’ (Steiner, 311). Tourist places have ‘other histories and geographies of nature, society and culture’. Hence, ‘sedimentated practices’ are central in the making of tourist places (2). Tourist places may be eroded, overlain by new sedimented practices and / or reconstructed at a later time’ (6).

In mapping new symbols onto reality, actors have the potential to create continuity between old and new situations (Abram & Lien, 10). Such ‘re-mapping’ might produce an alternative tourism narrative that addressed the ‘conflict’, and paved the way for an alternative scenario reflecting past and present’s continuity in meaningful ways (Hewison, 1987)

If the business remained in the family, I saw no reason why its future should not reflect what was currently excluded. Lack of concern about how the couple’s son might run the business suggested that introducing new perspectives was a prospect free of conflict for the male respondent. As stated, if a continuity between past, present and future were established, meanings from the family’ past might be seen in terms ‘tomorrow’s history’ (Marvel and Simm, 127). In past and present being performed ‘intertextually’ (128),
ethnic or cultural identity might be given renewed tourism relevance. Identity’s meaning could emerge from historical reinterpretation of past and present’s continuity (Hewison).

Again, were identity manifestations seen as layers open to tourism development, they might become future diacritical marks of identity (Cohen, 383. ‘Diacritical’ as in marking distinctions and enabling discrimination; in this case, from from tourism competitors.) I recalled my liking de la Barre’s suggestion that, for progressive development to occur, it was ‘a prerequisite for history to be open’ (ibid.).

On my first evening on the island, my host told me one difference between coastal and inland Sámi was that the gákti of inlanders were ‘more colourful’. I noticed he used the Norwegian kofte to describe this traditional costume, not the Sámi gákti. When I asked him why, he said: ‘Oh, we say kofte’. I later discovered gákti is mááccuh in Inari Sámi and máäccäk in Skolt Sámi (sanosesaameksi.yle.fi); and gaëptie in South Sámi (gtweb.uit.no). It seemed odd to me he should use the Norwegian word. This appeared to contradict a view Kramvig describes (2005, 59): ethnicity in Finmark has often been considered a ‘question of purity - either Norwegian or Saami’ (‘you cannot have both’). It also seemed to suggest ‘ethnically mixed’ situations might result ‘in a situation of ambiguity’ (ibid.), and correspondingly complex identity perceptions. Such a view might reject the ‘idea of cultural purity’ (61). According to Kraft (222), ethnic diversity has, in any case, contributed to the image of northern Norway as ‘different, and only ambiguously Norwegian’.

My male respondent went on to say perhaps the most significant difference between coastal and inland Sámi communities was, inlanders had always been nomadic while coastal people were fishers and farmers. Inland Sámi were mainly reindeer herders who moved with their herds. Sea-Sámi’s economy was built on small-scale fishing and farming (reference). Later, he said he felt coastal Sámi might have ‘lost something with the boats.

I have thought about this comment quite a lot. At first, I thought he had meant: the seaward orientation of coastal communities resulted in more negative external influences that did not affect inland communities. However, when I asked him to explain, he said Finmark’s inland Sámi had always had close ties with Sámi in Sweden, Finland and Russia. I then reconsidered his meaning. Inland communities might have been enriched by connections across wide areas. Inter-regional interaction would have been less of an option for coastal communities. In not being nomadic, these communities did not reflect ‘embodied’ patterns of movement: patterns that might nourish identity through contact
with other Sámi. In telling me I had said it better than he could himself, my host confirmed my second understanding.

Olsen (2006, 39) confirms this understanding. Sámi started to see themselves as Norwegian during the process of Norwegianization, particularly along Finnmark’s coast, in coastal areas, settled Sámi were integrated in Norwegian and European trade systems. They lived side-by-side with Norwegians. In contrast, for the interior’s reindeer herders, the ‘Sámi milieu’ was ‘more homogenous’, and ‘the change to be Norwegian’ was ‘less dominant’.

In this context, what my host said had been ‘lost with the boats’ may have referred to a strong sense of coastal Sámi identity. What was so interesting here, for me, was how indirectly he referred to his own historical understanding. Reading between the lines, I saw ‘might have lost something’ was a great understatement. His sheer geniality in expressing it seemed far removed from ‘historical interpretations’ that might lead to ‘devastating conflicts over competing versions of the common past’ (Mathiesen 2010, 70). Park’s ‘physical and psychological remnants’ of the past (ibid.) were met with even-temperedness.

As a storyteller, my host had conveyed to me a personal imaginary that described a ‘singular and historical (way) of living, seeing and making (an) existence’ (Castoriadis, 1975). His imaginary’s ‘meaning-making and world shaping’ potential (Salazar, 2012) had begun to make his ‘world’ accessible to me in ways that began to challenge any essentialist conceptualisations I might have of his identity (De la Barre, 826). His stories affirmed identity and pride (ibid.). I was struck by how he ‘remembered, voiced and lived’ the location’s place identity (ibid.) His memory seemed to have assumed a life-force of its own (Park, 95)

I was surprised when my host told me he did not speak Sámi. My unreflexive assumption was every Sámi spoke at least some of the language. He then told me a personal story. His grandfather was the last Sápmi speaker in the family. This was at the time of what Kramvig (2005, 58) describes as the state’s ‘harsh assimilation process towards the Saami population’ (i.e., the 1960s). Saami language, names and other significant symbols were lost for two generations. Olsen (2009, 41) describes how during this period (the 1960s) children in most coastal villages stopped learning at this time. Sámi was the grandfather’s only language. My male respondent said his grandfather had not spoken Norwegian at all until in adulthood. Then, he ‘had to learn the hard way’. This meant going to a number of mainland schools. As a young man, the male respondent wanted to
learn Sámi from his grandfather. However, the grandfather did not want to teach a language that was considered ‘shameful’ (his word). He refused to teach his grandson Sámi.

There are nine distinct Sámi languages (Kramvig, 2010, 72). Like the customised gákti, each is specific (in this case, to particular locations). Sámi communities’ value these identity markers. Some would find a single ethnic category being ascribed to them unacceptable. Kramvig describes the need of these communities to ‘speak for themselves’, and an understandable desire not be reduced to ‘one voice, one past’ (73). However, questions of how to bring the past into the present remain ‘painful for many people’ (ibid.). Sámi cultural expression remains fragile, since it reflects ‘highly contested, valuable, repressed and often painful stories and experiences’ (ibid).

An integrated tourism identity that brings the past into the present might be unrealistic in the best of circumstances. By ‘integrated’ here, I mean suggesting a synthesis over time of an individual’s past, present and future selves: or a degree of self-continuity that, on an individual level, is analogous to sedimentation of palimpsest on a larger scale. Hence, in an integrated tourism identity might reflect episodic information that is consistent across multiple personal, interpersonal and touristic contexts.

Such consistency might seem problematic following a history of ‘norsification’ (Barents Observer, 2017). At one time, the Norwegian state and its majority population discouraged public use of the Sámi language and displays of its culture, encouraging the concealment of Sámi identity in a process not dissimilar to social Darwinism. This might well result in a sense of protective identity custodianship. Historical identity suppression may still be a negative influence on tourism practice that seeks to foreground ethnic identity. Such a scenario may be complicated, further, where one ethnic group with a dual identity is inferior (numerically) to another. This is sometimes the case with Sámi living in Norway who are both Sámi and Norwegian. However, Finnmark as a “place” throughout this paper, I am motivated by this theoretical approach and its concept of place, through which any geographical entity, be it for example a village or a county, may be approached analytically (Granás, 49).

Nexus emerges within politically conjoined processes where the place is ‘...constructed through the specificity of [its] interaction with other places...’ (Massey, 1994, p. 121). It should be remembered that ‘ethnic labelling is convoluted’; some may find it hard to decide and for many, ethnic belonging is considered a private matter that one does not want or does not bother to talk about. Instead, places are made up of flows and move-
ments and the myriad interlinkages and interdependencies among places. They are simultaneously local and global, their social, cultural and economic relations stretched out across the globe, shaped by structural processes but retaining local particularities. (1991c, 1993, 1995b)

5.8 Veiled Stories

Dusk fell at the location last October. I had been waiting for the return of a tourist fishing boat. Five Finns in their thirties had been deep-sea fishing all day. I had spent part of the previous evening with these young people. I saw an opportunity to observe how my subject, who was waiting on the pier, interacted with other tourists.

The Finns had caught one halibut, but it was their first day. As it came in, someone was sitting on the boat’s edge with legs dangling overboard. I wondered if this was wise. Every year, an average of thirty-plus people die in accidents related to use of recreational sea craft in Norway (source: Norwegian Maritime Authority). 10% of these fatalities are foreign tourists. The most common reasons for this figure are lack of experience in the use of open boats and ignorance of weather and local climates. Foreign tourists are often seen in boats unsuitable for sea conditions. As boat renters, the family are responsible for the safety at sea of their fishing guests. The tourism business is also responsible for making sure hired equipment is not a safety risk. The family are obliged to give all necessary information on use of equipment and assess inherent risks (ibid.). This mean to a lot of responsibility.

As we talked, my respondent told me the boat’s small deckhouse was similar, in size, to a sometime Sámi dwelling. A deckhouse is short, house-like structure on the upper deck of a boat. On the Finn’s boat, the deckhouse might have accommodated two people standing up, but no more. This was out of earshot of the Finns. I found his remark striking. It seemed to invite a distinction between tourism’s perhaps necessary neglect of its context (Cohen’s ‘make believe’: Lanfant et als’ fantasies’), and that context’s personal and historical significance for the respondent. From his performance, two entirely separate world’s seemed to ‘emerge relationally’(Abram and Lien 11). From the context, I understood this invitation would remain implicit. This perceived expression both of tourism and non-tourism identities was so subtly folded into performance, it seemed not to be there. Nevertheless, in following Noy (2002) and listening carefully, I had heard the
slightest suggestion of a ‘subversive and silenced voice’: a ‘resistive narrative’ that transcended the tourism context. Later, this raised another interesting question: what can and cannot be said in expressing identity meaning(s) in tourism.

The apparent complexity of this interaction recalled Bourdieu and Wacquant’s suggestion the difficulty of ‘thinking the social world’ cannot be overstated (1992, 251). The authors view communicative exchanges as merely ‘expressions of the constructed space of objective relations. Significantly for me, they stress the importance of ‘grasping a hidden reality that veils itself by unveiling itself’, and ‘offers itself to observers only in the anecdotal form of the interaction that conceals it’ (256). Later, I saw this episode in terms of Kramvig’s view some stories may not be heard as stories at all, so deeply are they embedded in everyday life (75). If non-tourism meanings were similarly embedded in tourism practice, André’s distinction between tourism / non-tourism meaning(s) might be reconsidered. The ‘invitation’ I had heard might, then, be made explicit, and an interesting story be more fully told.

5.9 Conflicting imaginaries

Tribe (2004, 55: cited in Noy, 45) states much tourism knowledge is generated for profitability. Knowledge production becomes a search for what is ‘useful in terms of marketability and efficiency’. My male respondent’s reluctance to introduce heritage aspects, and their meaning(s), into tourism is inconsistent with this market orientation. I have thought this reluctance might come from Nuttall’s ‘small scale culture’ that emphasises ‘kinship, reciprocity and cultural identity’ (121). It seems to suggest an almost moral understanding of what is good, bad, right or wrong in tourism practice.

The male respondent believes his shamanic knowledge comes from nature. His belief this knowledge is incompatible with tourism seems, to me, to involve ‘moralising (a) relationship to an externalised Nature’ (Abram and Lien, 5). It certainly seems to contradict Lanfant’s suggestion (op. cit.) ‘there is nowhere a priori which might not be brought into (tourism’s) embrace’. The apparently inherent meaning the respondent gives to aspects of his heritage, if not a priori, seems to be strongly resistant - if not impervious - to that embrace.

Compartmentalisation may be a defence mechanism. It would be understandable were the respondent to resist indigenous knowledge being ‘decontextualised and reified’ (Nuttall, 1-2). On the other hand, Nuttall suggests indigenous Arctic resource management might ‘provide models for the inclusion of indigenous values and environmental
knowledge in the design, negotiation and implementation of global environmental policy’ (ibid). He argues that ‘environmental policy-making will only be successful if it includes local knowledge and recognises cultural values’ (6).

The repeated stress on ‘doing the right thing’ in the empirical context seems at odds with the ‘particular capitalist social imaginary’ that informs ‘how we collectively make sense of and act in the world’ (Wright and Nyberg, 2016, 172). Resistance to this imaginary might be contrasted with the (arguably) collective imperative that every commercial opportunity should be exploited. The functionality of that past (i.e., how and by whom it is used) remains problematic for the respondent. On the one hand, his limiting the ‘touristically functional’ may have an impact on the tourism business’s development. However, the embrace of tourism markets, clearly, is not the default position for all. The view we use ‘personal imagination, as well as collective imaginaries, to represent our life-world and attribute meaning to it’ (Salazar, 5) may indicate why this is so.

Non-tourism identity can be reflected in tourism practice. That identity’s commercial potential may be restricted, if not discounted, by a personal ‘imaginary’. The inclusion of non-tourism identity in practice can be seen as problematic. However, what is currently excluded from tourism might be included in future if given new meaning(s).
6. Tourism’s Responsibility

6.1 A maritime environment

In October 2018, I waited for the ferry to the island under an overcast and, I thought, sinister sky. Sour orange-yellow light ran parallel to the horizon. However, things soon improved. Even from inside my car I tasted sea-oxygen on my arrival at Kvalsund. Later, I often found the quality of the island’s air breathtaking. In this respect, the island often seemed a place apart to me (‘apart’ in the most positive sense).

The island has a long tradition of farming, fishing and sea husbandry. A tradition to which the male respondent and his ancestors belong. André’s parents used to run a fish factory at the location. The original factory was rebuilt in 1960. The business closed in 1992. The respondent recalled threading handmade fishing nets as a child. He said children used to go to sea young. His wife added the gender-based template in coastal communities once was, males fished at sea while females ran homes and farmed.

She said local fishermen had always needed detailed knowledge of the sea (meer: reference) to ensure a good catch. Knowing when and where fish can be caught was still passed on. Fishing tourism remains at the core of the tourism business. Eleven twenty-foot boats, all equipped with electronic navigation and safety gear, are available for hire (the tourism business homepage).

The male respondent said fishermen never threw anything away. He added some locals now had problems finding space for their refuse. Many barns were full of disposable material. His wife added some the location residents now used the tourism business’s facilities for their own disposal. This was too much responsibility for one family. It also seemed unfair. It takes 1500 kroner to have one large trash container emptied. Disposal works out at about 3 kroner per kilo.

The female respondent said that some French National Park employees visiting the island recently encouraged greater environmental awareness in other guests. Planning to take much of their refuse home, the French saw people throw cans in the sea. The couple have observed other differences between tourists by nationality. For example, anyone not sticking to agreed fishing rules can secure an unfair advantage. My male respondent said most fishing tourists disapproved of this, but it happened. Fishing boats and equipment can also be contaminated by seaborne infections. Boats and equipment need to be disinfected before moved between waterways. Again, this does not always happen.
6.2 Awareness of change

My male respondent said environmental awareness changed when people started questioning what they throw away. He was shocked to find one of his old buoys, from 1987, in the sea last year. Local fishermen also recognise their debris in fjord clean-ups. These finds are now considered shameful. However, fjord clean-ups have become educational tools for children here. Children learn environmental awareness in practice.

The respondent said there once seemed to be fewer environmental problems. Certainly, there was less environmental awareness. Birds used to eat what was thrown away at sea. The sea took the rest. Even fish guts are now sent for oil extraction. Nothing was simply thrown away. He added the Environment was now “forced to mean something”.

This seemed significant to me since reflected how changes in meaning can come about, despite what was thought in the past. The respondent admitted he could do better on best environmental practice. The island’s location was an incentive to maintain high standards. “This is the Arctic” he said. “It should be clean.”

Such a positive imperative is somewhat at odds with empirical evidence. Nuttall (1998, 8) describes Arctic haze as a ‘photo-chemical smog that contains pollutants from industrial activity that are transported from Eurasia by air towards the north polar regions’. This haze carries sulphur particles that threaten low-level atmospheric ozone, disrupt atmospheric energy flows and contribute to acid rain. Copper, lead, zinc and arsenic have been found in lichens and mosses in Alaska, Sweden, Norway and Finland, and ‘in some of the Arctic’s prime fishing grounds’ (ibid.). Norway’s substantial cruise tourism sector also contributes to air and sea pollution (data to follow). Extensive consumption of fossil fuels and high carbon emission levels are two consequences.

Again, it should be remembered that the ‘diverse regions of the circumpolar north’ - while relatively remote - are ‘developed, populated areas’ (Coates 1994 - cited p. 5). It would be plain wrong to suggest these regions are immune to environmental degradation. The Arctic is not innocent of the ‘hazards of globalisation and modernity until spoiled by extrinsic circumstances’ (11). Arctic climate processes influence global conditions. In turn, these contribute to further Arctic change (ibid.).

In one sense, these data are ‘merely’ indicative. In terms of my research question, however, they also suggest how incomplete current perspectives can be. Perceptions of the Arctic as ‘clean’ reflect part of the story but, clearly, not
all of it. I saw this as an illustration of how narratives and meanings that reflect a partial perspective might subsequently be revised. Ingold (1993, 168) states: ‘it is apparent that the world becomes a meaningful place for people through being lived in, rather than through having been constructed along the lines of some formal design (Ingold, 1993, 168). Tourism actors ascribe meaning to the environments they inhabit and work in. In the context I am exploring … meaning, rather than correlating to reality in the correspondence theory of truth, actually constitutes reality. Salazar’s ‘patterns of forgetfulness and attentiveness’ (6). The imaginary can thus be conceived as a mental, individual and social process that produces the reality that simultaneously produces it. Current perspectives can be reconsidered in more meaningful ways, or ways that are newly meaningful in light of reflection. The study of narratives is important to understand the meanings individuals attach to their experiences (Mura & Sharif, 2017). This also goes for the imaginary considered in the theory chapter.

6.3 Change

The National Park covers 3163 square km and 53% of the island (Bjørn). It includes 9,6 square km. of sea. Norwegian national parks are designed to safeguard vulnerable and threatened ecosystems, and to preserve areas of international, national and regional worth. Encroachment, harvesting, pollution and climate change are recognised as primary negative external factors (www.visitnorway.com). Respondents encourage visitors to the National Park to give them contact details and say how long they plan to be away. They then check people return as planned. The National Park Board have stated their appreciation of this voluntary effort (reference).

The couple see the park as quality stamp. However, the male respondent said its glaciers were melting rapidly, since they were plateau glaciers (ice caps covering whole mountains). These glaciers are especially vulnerable to climate change. One of them, Nordmannsjøkelen, has shrunk by 90% since 1895 and may soon melt away entirely (Bjørn).

When I asked the respondent why melting glaciers mattered to him, he said these glaciers were ‘part of the island’. They were the northernmost in Europe, and unique in being below 1000 metres. He said the tourism business marketed this ‘uniqueness’. If a glacier was lost, the tourism appeal of the island’s uniqueness would diminish. This seemed a clear illustration of how climate change’s negative impact on tourism is perceived by someone self-employed in the industry. It also suggested the erosion of at least
one of the island’s identity features is beyond control. However, if unique identity mark-
ers such as glaciers are (regrettably) in danger, it struck me that this might give this tour-
ism business the opportunity to consider equally uncommon alternatives. This scenario is
reflected in the premise of my research question.

My male respondent told me about an old supply of DDT (dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane) he still had problems getting rid of. Almost regretfully, he said the insecticide had been extremely effective. It ‘killed’ everything it came in contact with. Its ban (in the 1970s) is considered a major factor in the resurgence of the bald eagle and the near-extinct peregrine falcon in the US (Zolnikov, 2018, 86-7). I thought this was a good example of how the respondent had reconsidered past meaning(s) relative to something once thought safe.

Plastic came up repeatedly in our conversations. My female respondent said it was now common knowledge that plastic can last a millennium. Finding plastic on the island in childhood used to be fun, my male respondent said. Items washed up from as far away as Brazil. These were collectors’ items. Introductions to the wider world. Of course, every-
thing had now changed. This was a further example of how what was once taken for
granted had then been given new meaning.

I thought these stories might add texture to what I saw was an emerging narrative: the National Park’s exceptional qualities, the regrettable impact of climate change, local tourism’s reflections and responses to change, the contrast between past and present. after
reading all this stuff about environment, it struck me how this part of the data represents a twist to the past-present-future dynamics in your material.

6.4 To, from and on the ‘periphery’

My male respondent told me fishing tourists cannot be stopped going as far out to sea as they want in rental boats. Some go beyond the neighbouring island
and into the Norwegian or Barents Seas. This can be ill-advised. There are important dif-
fferences between fjord and open or deep-sea fishing. In bad weather, even the local fjord becomes like open sea. Tourists unaware of this may not return to land alive. My female
respondent added every fjord on the island had lost someone to the sea. Fishing tourists
can be as unlucky as anyone else.

I have experienced the challenges of the island’s weather and infrastructure my-
self. I left the island in October last year, planning to be on the 07:30 ferry. My car’s
windscreen had frozen over. I thought better of driving the 19 km to the ferry, blind.
While the road is reasonably good, anyone should think twice about taking it winter darkness. (I took my eyes off the road for a second. I felt I was driving sideways on refocusing.) Even winter tires lose their grip. General electricity can be unreliable here. The roadside lights were out.

Road signs were covered in ice and snow. My female respondent said snow often brought ‘chaos’ to the island. There was a false alarm at the prospect of a 20-centimetre fall overnight, but it was bitterly cold. Defrosting the window took so long, I thought I might miss the boat. I saw two red lights zip along the fjord at 06:40 (maybe for the 07:30 ferry). If I had to make this journey every day, I would be better prepared. Some people get disoriented on the island. This had not bothered me till now. That morning, I was not sorry to get off the island. My female respondent mailed me this January, advising me to cancel another trip to the island. ‘Extreme winds’ had led to ferry cancellations. I should wait for more stable weather. My destination had been cut off by avalanches. It would stay so till roads were cleared. When I phoned the couple, they told me their son was attending an emergency school, travel to school on the mainland being impossible. Apparently, this was a routine contingency. Little was said during our exchange, beyond expressions of regret. ‘Emergency’ said it all.

Respondents told me that the Norwegian authorities now take a keen interest in tourism in remote areas like theirs. Tourists may need to be rescued or receive emergency care. This can require resources in short supply. My male respondent added the Global Positioning System emergency response services use to find missing persons can be interrupted by bad weather. He said the Joint Rescue Coordination Centre for Northern Norway (Hovedredningssentralen i Nord-Norge) is based in Bodø, almost 500 km from the island. My female respondent told me, in 2011, three snowmobilers from Finnmark got lost and died in a mainland snowstorm. None of them was prepared for harsh weather. She added

The island’s remoteness contributes to respondents’ sense of responsibility for their guests. In terms of the responsibilities the couple already have, I started to wonder how realistic developing ‘new tourism meaning’ might be for the tourism business.

My male respondent said he was proud some tourists had been returning to the island since his marriage. However, he told me a Norwegian group left the location this March due to the weather. There was a storm and the tourists felt they had ‘nothing to do’. Many tourism sites can offer indoors activity in the event of bad weather or rely on an infrastructure of ‘things to do’. I saw little evidence of this at the location. Again, I
thought of the potential of alternative attractions. I remembered my male respondent’s story telling. I thought of every colourful detail respondent had described. Despite my misgivings, the idea of new ‘articulations’ (Simonsen) still came to mind.

‘Our tourism business means we’re basically stuck here’ my male respondent said. Nature ruled out my visit to the location this January (see …). the location was inaccessible. Last October, my plans to visit south the island were also disappointed. The island’s only tourism operators were away. When I got back to Alta from another trip to the location, the Tourism Office could only give me ferry times to the north. No-one I spoke to at the location seemed at all informed about the island’s south. Ferry facilities were being upgraded there, but no-one was clear. I have still not visited the island’s south. Tourism operators’ absence ruled my visit out. This told me the island’s tourism infrastructure remains relatively undeveloped. The Tourism Office’s response added to my sense of the island as a place that can escape even people determined to go there.

The island’s northern residents being unaware of the island’s south added to my sense of the location as a place apart. Lanfant et als’ lack of coherence between centres and peripheries seemed to apply to peripheral locations themselves. These observations suggested the integration of discrete elements my research question examines might have application in a wider context. A context where new tourism meaning(s) could be given by - as it were - joining up the dots.

Their tourism business means respondents can never take more than one week’s annual holiday. The isolation bad weather can bring adds a dimension to ‘being stuck’. Given the often poor weather here, I thought life at the location must, sometimes, be more than a little hard. When I brought this up, however, my male respondent told me life was ‘100% normal’. This seemed to challenge preconceptions on peripheral exceptionalism: the idea life on the ‘periphery’ must be harder than living somewhere else (references to follow). I thought it marked a significant distinction between local and outside worlds and their respective perceptions: the environment’s ‘relational effects’ (Viken: see below).

My female respondent said some recent Dutch tourists were ‘blown away’ by the location. The Dutch found it spectacular. The Dutch said that their culture was so stratified and the Netherlands so populous, they could barely cope with the island’s environment: the local fjord, the vast wilderness of the nearby park, the sense of being apart. In the following breath, she told me Nature should not be romanticised. I wondered why, and asked what Nature meant to her. She told me a story. She had gone for a walk to a nearby lake. She sat for an hour, listening to birdsong and rustling leaves. Idyllic - until
she realised the birdsong had stopped and the wind died down. ‘The silence was deafening. And I panicked.’

One feature of the island’s identity is its specific and singular wilderness character. Specificity, here, is considered ‘a specific articulation of different social practices, narratives, relations and materiality’s’ (Simonsen, 17). If the validity of ‘wilderness’ remains debatable (reference), Paulgaard’s ‘rough, dramatic and spectacular landscape’ (2008, 57) might do. Viken (2010, 112) sees this remoteness as being ‘as much a mental construct as a reality’ (ibid.). Realities are produced alongside the statements that report them. They are enacted in relations they describe. Reality is ‘a relational effect’ (ibid.).

I saw the Dutch’s awe and the female respondent’s experience of Nature marked a clear distinction. Home and away, their environments ‘relational effects’. Places might seem extraordinary to one person but as ordinary as home to someone else. ‘One person’s excitement may be another’s boredom’ (Graburn, 34). Still, the female respondent’s story told me the ‘ordinariness’ of home could also be quite extraordinary.

It struck me her story was somewhat paradoxical. The silence that had panicked her was something she had earlier described as a potential tourism attraction. The family had said … This suggested something tourism actors find uncomfortable in their environments can have tourism appeal. It also recalled André’s conflict. I saw the potential for the ‘articulation’ of new social practices, narratives, relations and materialities’ in both contexts. Viken’s statements that report perceptions had the potential to combine ‘relations and materialities’ with ‘practices and narratives’. This combination might identify a place I found rich in contrast, ambiguity and mystique in new ways if included in future representations of the island.

The expression of such ambiguity suggested a rich tourism identity that transcended what tourists might expect and reflected, in new and original ways, Finnmark’s mixed ethnicity. Precisely in not creating an image for tourists to ‘recognise’ (Olsen, 3), tourism actors might use their freedom to improvise and create anew. In terms of Mauborgne’s ‘blue ocean thinking’, outstanding creativity and innovation always have the potential to leave any opposition standing (Mauborgne, 2004). I realise not everyone would agree with this argument.
7. Conclusion

One of the most interesting dimensions of this study has been how tourism categories are produced and reproduced in a context where ‘thresholds between’ are ambiguous and continually unsettled. In this sense, how informants keep some identity aspects out of their tourism business, while allowing other aspects to be included, appears to be an area that is in flux. This suggests the indeterminate character of tourism categories and has been of central importance to the research question, in its consideration of categories’ meanings creation, maintenance and flexibility.

Cultural and ethnic distinctions between ‘Sámi’ and ‘Norwegian’ categories have been addressed, in terms of what are seen as mutually exclusive categories. What has been of interest here is how essentialist conceptions can be contested. For instance, it appears to me that my main informant does not conform to a recognisable model of difference (for example, an emblematic Sami). This has suggested to me that an ongoing sense identity ambiguity is not necessarily a matter that needs to be resolved. One interesting feature of the empirical context is how contested criteria can appear to derive from uncomfortable situations that, all the same, are not seen as need of resolution. Some of the same (as previous com- ment). Means reformulating, for example from “have been addressed” to “will be addressed”. Another example: from “the research has shown”, to “the analysis will address”.

Questions of identity have been of particular interest in a context where the continuity of the past has been ruptured. This rupture occurred, not only as result of the Second World War, but also of the emergence of one identity (Norwegian) at the expense of another (Sámi) in the empirical context. This rupture is important, since my Sámi informant’s principles leave him conflicted on introducing cultural and historical identity features in tourism today. The research has thus suggested how historical interpretation is one perspective from which tourism meanings are constructed. The research also suggests that a history ‘othering’ of ethnic identity appears to have produced a normative prohibition that excludes cultural and heritage meanings from tourism practice. Since some of the foundations of individual and collective identity have been ruptured, the research has also brought to my mind the complexity of ‘doing the right thing’ in terms of how meaning is ascribed to remnants of that disruption in developing a meaningful whole (Hewson).
Another feature of the research shows is how the main informant wrestles with questions of ethnicity and tourism in terms of doing the right thing. This indicates the complex ways in which my subject’s values and assumptions (his ‘vision’) are seen in terms of what tourism ‘ought’ to be (Caton, 2012). The research has pointed to the importance of subjects’ principles in determining what tourism should, or should not, be about. In this way, it has strongly suggested to me subjects’ tourism practice is ‘loaded with moral implications’ (ibid.). A degree of diversity, or pluralism, in moral beliefs and practices appear to be integral to subjects’ ways of life and sustaining a livelihood in an out of the way place (ibid.).

The research may confirm Lanfant’s suggestion that aspects of modernity (such as increased mobility and displacement) have implications for the continuity tourism in terms of place identity. This would have implications for the future, where potential emigration threatens both the preservation of tradition, and potential tourism development. In this sense, present decisions about what is right that are informed by past understandings may have a potential bearing on tourism’s future.

The difficulty of reconciling commoditisation’s market orientation with heritage is clearly suggested in the empirical context. The research has therefore gone on to consider how commoditisation’s potentially negative effects may be a factor in the main informant’s exclusion of past meanings from current tourism practice. In considering the visual and symbolic representation of Sámi identity in terms of commoditisation, this study has brought home to me that using cultural phenomena as a tourism products may be problematic for. In this way, the research indicates a degree of resistance to tourism’s interventions (Lanfant). It has also shown how cultural and heritage meanings may be seen in terms, not only of potential development, but also of decline, or being otherwise diminished, if used in tourism.

My main informant’s resistance to oversimplification may be the result of his opposition to a prevalent tourism imaginary is repeatedly illustrated by . This resistance seemed to be reflected in terms of what is and what is not for sale what can and cannot be said, what can and cannot be used in tourism. In this way, this research suggests that personal and place-specific narratives and imaginaries may be selective, and continue to exclude what is seen as unacceptable in tourism practice. Any change in perspective relative to the meaning of the acceptable must, thus, be seen as a matter of choice. This has led me to the conclusion that ‘tourism practice’ is about more about the practices of tourism business owners’ that the practices of tourists’. Empirical observations suggest a rather
imprecise relation between subjective experience and the imaginary (Salazar), and point to how inexact a sense of what is (un)acceptable in tourism has been reached. However, observations also suggest how a personal imaginary can be well enough established to take precedence over, if not exclude, potential tourism development. This may indicate that my main informant’s resistance to what is, arguably, a shared viewpoint is consistent with running a successful tourism business. That viewpoint holds that tourism should exploit every opportunity available to it.
8. Challenges

8.1 A note on language

Alvesson and Skoldberg state language is ambiguous, unstable and context-dependent (1). Both my female informant in this research and I are native English speakers. My main informant is bilingual (Norwegian-English). His ability with English was a factor in my approaching him as a potential informant. No matter what an informant’s first language, however, it will influence their use of another language. The implications of this for my understandings of spoken data collected from this informant are potentially profound. There must have be personal factors I brought to the empirical context that I was unaware of. We have all been conditioned or socialised into patterns of behaviour. One of these may have been my overestimating my comprehension ability relative to what my main informant said. This may the result of years spent teaching English as a Foreign Language.

While I talked informally about the progress of my research as it went along, my research question was not put directly. One danger here was that informants may have failed to see the value of their contributions, and thus felt it was inconsequential. One related potential problem has been their possible failure to see the value of their contributions to my research. In this sense, I may have failed to sensitise my female informant, in particular, to the value of what she told me. I hope I never failed to approach her with a positive tone and attitude, on an equal footing, and making the integrity of my intentions clear. However, I may inhibited her from expressing additional value data by not making her sufficiently aware of her contributions’ value.

Indirectly, this brings me to the questions of my research’s Norwegian readership. This text has grown out of the research process. In a way, the act of writing, itself, has become a way of ‘knowing’ and ‘being’. I am the first to admit that my text may often be too complex, linguistically. Sometimes, I have wondered if my data analysis descriptions might not be more complex than the data itself.

Part of the problem here was that some data seemed to carry more meaning than others. However, writing one complex, abstract sentence after another runs the risk of losing a readers or, worse, of making no sense at all. The last thing I have wanted to do is to confuse, or lose, any of my readers. Part of my difficulty, here, has been coming to terms with the fundamental grammar this kind of academic writing requires. Since this has been quite a challenging task, a lot of re-writing has gone into this work. My final aim
has been that readers should be able to follow the sense of every sentence. I once read that reading should involve ‘the reduction of uncertainty’. In trying to express myself in this writing in an inviting, meaningful and open way, I have taken pains to be kind to the reader here, leaving minimal room for doubt.

8.2 The inner critic
Categories reflect conventional ways of doing things in a particular society, as determined by its major social institutions. By definition, they will restrict interpretation meaning. In this sense, they are like schemata: a mental model which we use to relate new to already known information. Both are socio-culturally influenced. Some of categories functions might be to define, classify, generalise, name, describe, report, speculate or predict. I still retain doubt about their emphasis in the research.

I sometimes felt so close to informants, I was almost tempted to start speculating on their tourism future. In a spirit of devil’s advocate, to creatively challenged to view their own world. I hope I have avoided making prescriptions, suggestions, prognoses, conjecture at all times. I was a researcher, not a consultant.

8.3 Opportunities
During my interaction with informants, I wanted to give them opportunities to communicate. My hope was my enthusiasm would be clear to informants in ways that made them comfortable enough to share their lives. My research seemed a useful exercise in creative autonomy. I also tried to encourage autonomy in my informants. I enjoyed working co-operatively with informants (that is, sharing and discussing research as it went along). I also think I managed to assimilate something of their world. As stated earlier, this is a world I would have avoided had I thought about it in advance.
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