TOURISMOS: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF TOURISM
Volume 1, Number 1, Spring 2006, pp. 9-27

SIGNIFYING PRACTICES AND THE CO-TOURIST

Daina Cheyenne Harvey
Rutgers University

Janet Lorenzen
Rutgers University

Within the paradigm of tourist studies there has recently been an acceptance of the democratization of tourism and consumption. Missing from the notion of the democratization of tourism is the role of status building through the creation of cultural capital enhancing experiences. While tourist spaces may be becoming democratized, the relationships between tourists within those spaces are not. Increasingly tourists are relying on the performance and presence of other tourists who have similar interests and motives, what we call the role of the co-tourist, to facilitate the tourist experience. This paper addresses the importance of recognizing status and consumption for the study of tourism, posits the notion of a co-tourist, and ends with some reflections on the co-tourist in Santa Barbara, California.

Keywords: *co-tourist; signifying; consumption; democratization; post-tourist*

INTRODUCTION

This article expands on Crouch, Aronsson and Wahlström's (2001) examination of 'doing tourism' by focusing on tourist interaction. We take it that central to what it means to be a tourist is the act of shared consumption experiences. And although Crouch, Aronsson and Wahlström (2001), Edensor (2001), and MacCannell (2001) have all focused on the reflexivity of tourists, or how tourists reproduce themselves, with a few exceptions[1] there has been an absence of work on the enabling of tourists by others, especially other tourists. Thus we focus on shared acts of consumption, or interactional consumption practices. To this end we have developed the notion of the co-tourist. The conception of the co-tourist is modeled on the post-tourist (Feifer, 1986; Torres, 2002) and the collective gaze (Urry, 1990) but with an emphasis on

differentiating acts of consumption for the purposes of accruing cultural capital and the increasingly interactional dimension of tourism required for the consumption of places. We begin by exploring the relationship between tourism and the production of status through consumption. A comparison of tourist typologies follows, as well as our addition to it. We offer a case study of the co-tourist in the tourist space of Santa Barbara wine country. This case study elaborates on our expectations of the importance of common practices, consumption patterns, and interactional accord for the boundaries of the co-tourist.

Status production is deeply referential, depending on the shared values tied to specific networks. Status production depends on patterns of interaction, and these patterns not only include objects and spaces, but also other people or co-tourists. Cultural capital not only determines our status but also determines the extent to which we are able to enhance our cultural affluence (Bourdieu, 1984). Additionally, it allows individuals to appraise the cultural worth of others, ultimately aiding them in determining the in or out-group status of the other. Recently it has been suggested by Holt (1995, 1997a, 1997b, 1998) that the ability of positional goods to convey status has eroded and more nuanced, contextual practices and patterns have arisen (see also Bourdieu, 1984). Holt's emphasis on analyzing patterns and practices rather than objects is reminiscent of Lefebvre's (1991) call to analyze the practices and relations within space, rather than the space itself. Tourist studies has not followed this trend toward contextual interaction, continuing to emphasize the objectification of space and place.

Urry (1995, 2000) has noted great ubiquity in the consumption of places, which has lead him and others (Peterson, 1997) to claim an omnivorous and cosmopolitan dimension to the consumption of space. Not only can anyone consume any space, but we are all constantly engaged in some form of consumption. With the rise of travel and access, Urry (2000) and Ritzer (2004) contend that space has become democratized. While some of this standardization is explained by time-space distanciation (Giddens, 1990, 1991), the end of distance (Cairncross, 1997), liquid modernity (Bauman, 2000), the globalization of the tourist gaze (Urry, 2000), the McDonalidizaton (Ritzer 1998, 1999, 2004) or the Disneyfication (Ritzer and Liska, 1997) of place, much of it is simply taken for granted. Also, the tourist's consumption of their destination has often eclipsed tourist interaction or strategic consumption during their visit.

More recent tourist studies focus on the specificities and multiplicities of tourist goals and experiences yet treat each tourist like a

discrete, rational actor. Milne (1998) has noted the rise of post-Fordist tourists who seek to distance themselves from mass tourism, while others (Ioannides and Debbage, 1998; Williams and Shaw, 1998) have noted the prolificacy of the neo-tourist who simultaneously seek authenticity yet enjoy consuming the staged non-authentic. While valuable, most studies of new types of tourists fail to consider the interactional dimension of tourists within space[2]. These new patterns are not divorceable from subjectivity.

Even theorists who have taken tourist studies to task for differentiating tourism from everyday activities have neglected to focus on the quotidian acts of consumption and interaction. Of the two theorists who come closest, Rojek (2000) focuses on performative structures and patterns and Edensor (2001) focuses on the performative roles of tourists, but neither combines the social work done by consumerism with the interactional milieus of tourism.

CONSUMPTION AND TOURISM

Historically one hallmark of travel and tourism has been the creation of social hierarchies between those capable of non-essential travel and those who are not. Travel and leisure have often been equated with freedom, mobility, independence from work, expending financial capital, individuality, and self-determination. In fact the consumption of historically unique, canonical, authentic places, like the Grand Tour, was once used as a rite of passage for the upper class. Simply gazing on a specific place was enough to accrue status. The accumulation of knowledge or class specific practices was encouraged and seeing far off places was sufficient to mark these distinctions. One did not necessarily have to learn or demonstrate skills acquired during the trip, simple social refinement was evidence enough of success. As such it was easy to maintain social hierarchies simply through the experience of travel.

When travel became accessible to the middle-class, social hierarchies were maintained by the use of consumer objects. Many theorists insist that elites intentionally define a certain set of consumer objects that have the power to signify elite status (Veblen, 1994 originally 1899; Warner, 1949; Simmel, 1957; Holt, 1997a, b). This allows elites to express their status and secure their position. These consumer objects are generally defined by elite consensus due to unique properties of scarcity or authenticity of production, and ultimately represent a high level of connoisseurship (Holt, 1997a). Within tourism this status differentiation

through consumer objects has been maintained through souvenirs and photographs. With the de-differentiation of tourism and travel, however, the consumption of objects or landscapes for the purposes of maintaining status has been rendered problematic.

According to this argument (Rojek and Urry, 1997; Urry, 2000) with the increasing mobility and flow of images, currency, and people, popular and elite culture meet up. Mobility allows for the de-differentiation of consumption and tourism, making cultural distinctions useless as everyone and anyone can consume anytime and anyplace; boundaries once maintained by the consumption of objects have become permeable. Thus, recent arguments move beyond the subject of cultural and economic elites to argue that a consumer culture has been largely adopted by all Americans and has even begun to promulgate a global consumer culture (Schor, 1998; Ritzer, 1999; Conca, 2002).

THE EVOLUTION OF CONSUMPTION

The place of tourism in the production of status has been modified by our increasing commitment to work. Baudrillard argues that, "leisure activities, as they develop, increasingly sink into competitiveness and the disciplinary ethic" (1998:156-7). As a result individuals attempt to accrue cultural capital in order to create or maintain a particular status. Historically most of leisure was characterized by the unproductive consumption of time and less frequently, the active creation of value through the "potlatch" of consuming time and goods in a nonproductive manner (Baudrillard, 1998:157). Part of that competition, he argues is that work is now being consumed in the interest of status and the burden of work is part of the cachet (Baudrillard, 1998). If we bring together the competition in work and the competition in leisure we find a resolutionary amalgamation of the two. Bringing a minimum amount of work into leisure has become a mark of status for some, as is the inability to take time off from work. In this and many other ways the contemporary tourist is distinguished from Veblen's leisure class where sophistication was associated with pure leisure (1994, originally 1899). Yet, Veblen predicted that leisure for itself would become stigmatized, opening it up to the influence of work and echoing the Protestant Ethic (1994).

Tourists can no longer consume free time as a status marker, because the ability for free time to connote value has been compromised. While many people still define their leisure through watching television or going to the movies, Meethan (2001) defines leisure as the consumption of

space. Yet, displaying value requires an approach beyond the gaze. The consumption of objects or vistas has been transcended by the differentiation of consumption practices. Value is no longer conferred on those who can display leisure time, but rather the way that leisure time is shaped by cultural practices and knowledge.

Adding ideas of distribution, Ritzer argues that the democratization of consumption has transformed conspicuous consumption into *inconspicuous* consumption (1999:210). The proliferation of chain stores and restaurants means that more and more people are consuming the same products at virtually the same places while experiencing standardized service (Ritzer, 1999). This expansion has two impacts on consumption. First, the leisure class or elites are similarly subject to this increase in inconspicuous consumption. And second, elite chains (jewelry, clothing, accessories) are also expanding their market presence making them more accessible, if not more affordable. Consequently, Ritzer argues that perpetuating stratification through consumption is increasingly difficult (1999).

However, due to the proliferation of consumption and the fragmentation of meaning in postmodernity, objects are becoming increasingly difficult to read, making the conversion of objects into status problematic (Holt, 1997a, b, 1998). Previously, a painting hung in a home indicated the cultural knowledge needed to consume it, today objects have been distanced from consumption practices. In addition, Doorne explains that objects in "cultural communication" become "distorted, reconstituted, and reinterpreted" (2003:139). And Martin's "bricolage" assures us that there are no longer status boundaries determined by objects (Urry 1990:90). As a result, objects no longer accurately embody cultural capital—which is not to say that the importance of cultural capital has diminished but rather that it requires a different path to do the work of social differentiation (Holt 1997a). Holt extends Bourdieu's theory that signifying objects have been replaced by signifying practices (1997a: 101). In other words, the uncertainty of object-signs has been supplanted by patterns and activities which Holt describes as "consumption patterns [that] are conceived as regularities in consumer behaviors, operationalized as the consumption of particular categories of goods and participation categories of leisure activities" (1997b:327). In this system, meaning is created intertextually, through relational distinctions between patterns (Holt 1997b). The intelligibility of status is not universal, meaning is contextual and individuals experience meaning within multiple contexts. There is no universal status designating practice and no practice that defines the essence of status. Status and significance are consequently

determined by the relation one pattern has to another and the "symbolic boundaries" of subsequent lifestyles (1997a, b, 1998).

As lifestyles are collective phenomenon with dynamic socio-historical compositions it makes sense to suggest that everyday taken for granted distinctions in lifestyles would follow us into our leisure activities and be reproduced in our role as tourists. While the democratization of tourism and consumption has seemingly negated this taken for granted assumption, there exists nonetheless a tradition within the paradigm of differentiating types of tourists.

A TYPOLOGY OF TOURISTS

Cohen's (1972, 2004) typology of tourists (Table 1) is based on the institutional setting of the tour. There are thus two types of tourists, institutional and non-institutional. Within each type there are two variants. Thus for Cohen all tourists can be arranged under four types. Urry (2000) likewise has conceived of types of tourists, associated with different gazes. The romantic gaze, the collective gaze, and the spectatorial gaze (Urry, 1995) differentiate tourists by how they look at objects. Although Urry claims to have based his typology on "different socialities" (2000:150), both Urry and Cohen's typologies lack an emphasis on the social dynamics of the tourist role; favoring, as do most perspectives on tourists, a solitary or co-present social orientation. The eschewing of a social emphasis stems from a number of trends within the analysis of tourism.

As Franklin and Crang point out, tourism studies have long suffered by being oriented to "industry led priorities and perspectives"(2001:5). This focus, while important, has resulted in the paradigm being dominated by issues of economic impact, supply and demand, and cost benefit analysis. Studies that emphasize this perspective have succeeded in equating tourists with industry-wide economic tendencies. Thus in addition to Cohen's typology we also have tourist types constructed around mass marketing (Urry, 1990; Williams and Shaw, 1998), post-Fordist production (Ioannides and Debbage, 1998), and niche marketing (Milne and Ateljevic, 2001). The most recent manifestation of this perspective has resulted in the explosion of studies that concentrate on economic redevelopment and regeneration through tourism (Byrne, 2001; Eisinger, 2000, 2003; Evans, 2001; Law 2002; Wöber, 2002; Hiernaux-Nicolas, 2003; Judd, 2003).

A second trend is the dominance of the gaze. The gaze, as established by Urry (1990, 1992) reduces the tourist to a passive construct. The tourist is constantly gazing, and hence not producing or being agentive. Although Urry and others have recognized the limits of the gaze, such critiques have not criticized the use of the gaze for either its visual determinism or its discontinuity (Franklin and Crang, 2001; MacCannell, 2001; Meethan, 2001; Sherlock, 2001). Under the aegis of the gaze, tourism has been theorized as a traditional cataloging of visual tourist spectacles rather than the accumulation of experiences—a tourist experience of seeing, not doing—where the tourist's consumption role is confined to the aesthetic, familiar, or iconic,

Table 1. Tourist typologies

PERSPECTIVE	LABEL	SOCIAL ORIENTATION & CONSUMPTION ROLE
Place	Organized Mass Tourist	co-presence, the iconic
Institutional	Individual Mass Tourist	solitary, the iconic
Non-Institutional	The Explorer	solitary, the unfamiliar
	The Drifter	solitary, anti-consumption
(Cohen 1972, 2004)		
Socialities	Romantic Gaze	solitary, the aesthetic
	Collective Gaze	co-presence, the familiar
	Spectatorial Gaze	co-presence, the iconic
(Urry, 1990, 1995:191)		
Marketing	Fordist	co-presence, Disneyified
	Post-Fordist	solitary, status markers—(through de-differentation)
	Neo-Fordism	co-presence, kitsch
(Urry, 1995:151; Torres, 2002:90)		
Environmental/ Intellectual	Untourist	solitary, the local personal style
(Huie, 1994 in Corrigan, 1997)		
Postmodern	Post-Tourist	solitary, kitsch and the iconic
(Feifer, 1986; Torres, 2002)		
Interaction	Co-Tourist	interaction, status markers
(Harvey and Lorenzen)		

A third trend, though long present, has been the quest for the authentic or real. MacCannell's (1973, 1976) original conception of the tourist was centered on the search for authenticity. Rather than stress the

role of the tourist, this trend resulted in focusing on objects of consumption (Featherstone, 1987; Tomlinson, 1990; Rojek, 1995; Appadurai, 1986). In other words, the products and spaces of tourist activity, rather than the activities themselves. This has resulted, as pointed out by Olsen, in positing "intimacy and closeness in relations" as beyond the tourist role (2002:176). Although there has been a call to go beyond authenticity (Lacy and Douglass, 2002), most work that calls authenticity into question remains mired in an examination of the tourist object and not the tourist subject—the object consumed and not the tourist herself.

A final trend has been the predominance of geography within the tourist paradigm. This dominance has resulted in orienting tourist theory and case studies to a geographical perspective and away from an examination of the complex social behavior of tourists. While the geographical perspective has been the main contributor to tourist studies, this reliance on a single perspective has resulted in the paradigm being oriented towards an examination of the proliferation of glocalization, that is, the global overtaking or integrating the local. The degree to which this has happened as been largely exaggerated. The tendency to focus on the global and local has also resulted in a spatial determinism for tourist studies. Thus rather than study tourist practices from a symbolic interactionist perspective, the current perspective reifies space and situates tourist roles as essentially being the product of certain spaces and places.

These trends, as Franklin and Crang (2001) suggest of other trends, have resulted in analyzing both tourists and tourism with a theoretical template. The result is that all tourist activities have to fit within a narrowly delimited range of acts or performances. Rather than overstate the complexity of the tourist role, as the progenitors of most typologies insist, these trends and their resulting typologies have tended to understate the complex nature of social relations inherent to tourism. One of the few exceptions to this trend of agentive underdevelopment has been Feifer's (1986) post-tourist, from which we draw our notion of the co-tourist.

The post-tourist

The post-tourist represents a type of tourist, but in many ways is a bricolage of previous typologies and the result of a reaction to some of the trends discussed in the previous section. The post-tourist has the cultural capital to realize that tourist activities are staged and yet still reveal in the inauthenticity and kitsch offered by the performances (MacCannell, 2001). The post-tourist while not constantly gazing, falls in and out of

gazes (Urry, 1992). Rather than having the ability or even the desire to go anywhere and do anything, the post-tourist knows all and sees all. She moves from one tourist role/performance to another. The space of Djurgården in Stockholm offers a prime example to further the description of the post-tourist.

On the island of Djurgården a tourist can go from imbibing the history of cultural artifacts at the Vasamusset to purchasing replicas of pottery found on the Wasa in the museum shop. From there the tourist can go to Skansen, the first open air museum, where original Lapp dwellings and a fifteenth century store sit amidst a recreated traditional village, where glass blowing demonstrations occur. The post-tourist has her choice of visiting the Rosendal Castle or going to Grönalaund, a modern amusement park, or doing both. However, the post-tourist realizes that what she is seeing has been arranged for her enjoyment. While the Wasa is the original ship, brought up from the bottom of Stockholm Bay after 333 years, the colors the Wasa has been repainted in come from what was known about other ships during that time, and hence are not entirely accurate. Also, Skansen encompasses a wildlife sanctuary for animals indigenous to the area, a zoo for animals from Africa and other parts of Europe, as well as an impressive architectural museum, and one of the best places to gaze out over the rest of Stockholm. The post-tourist realizes that tourism is staged (MacCannell, 1973, 2001; Urry, 1990; Edensor, 2001) and a game (Urry, 1990), but enjoys those spaces nonetheless.

The emergence of the post-tourist represents an important shift in the paradigm of tourist studies. The post-tourist is not the *normal* tourist whose temporal, spatial, and material consumption is a break from their daily habitus. The post-tourist carries her routine roles over to the role of tourist. More importantly there is no single role for the post-tourist to play. The post-tourist occupies herself with boundary play (Nippert-Eng, 2005). At times she plays the role of the bemused tourist or cultural interloper, and at other times engages in the role of the intellectual. Lacking from the concept of the post-tourist, however, is the role that other tourists play in enabling one to perform the role of tourist. Absent is an emphasis on the social interaction among tourists.

ORIGINS OF THE CO-TOURIST

The co-tourist finds its origins in Urry's (1990:140) notion of the collective gaze. However, our conception of the co-tourist goes beyond

the gaze (see Table 2). Urry notes that "the character of the 'collective' gaze and the role of others like oneself in constituting the attraction of certain places" yet he neglects to follow up on the need for the tourist role to include "the social composition of fellow tourists" (1990:140). Thus for Urry the collectivity in tourism is limited to gazing at an object or performance with other tourists. While he recognizes that social groups can differ in who they find appropriate to engage with in tourist activities, "…different expectations are held by different social groups about who are appropriate others to gaze at oneself", he believes that "these preferences cannot be reduced solely to issues of social class" (1990:141).

Table 2. Comparison: Tourist Typifications

TRADITIONAL TOURIST	POST-TOURIST	CO-TOURIST
Sun and Fun	The Quotidian	Social Capital
Grand Tour/Authenticity	(Staged)Authenticity	Authenticity(Staged)
Collective	Individual	Dyadic
Iconic Spaces	Kitsch Spaces	Relational Spaces
Relevant	Realistic	Relational
The Gaze	The Theater	The Game
Seeing	Doing	Interacting

While preferences alone cannot *always* be reduced to social class, economic class, and more appropriately, class specific capital, these often configure the parameters of the tourist role. What Urry ignores is the social symbolism of shared consumption (Hogg *et al*., 2000) and the social interaction that increasingly configures the role of the tourist. While tourism itself should not be reduced to the gaze, neither can the collectivity of tourism be reduced to the collective gaze. Here we wish to differentiate the co-presence of other tourists as participants in mass forms of tourist activities, what Urry is referring to, and the co-tourist.

Having other tourists present does not necessarily result in social interaction nor is it always essential for the completion of the tourist role. Tourists who go on cruises are certain to be surrounded by other tourists, but it is not necessary to engage in interaction with them, nor does the successful completion of the cruise depend on their shared consumption. Of course it might be an odd experience if no other tourists were on board the ship, but one could still go about being a tourist. Likewise it is unlikely that you will ever experience the Eiffel Tower in solitude. There will always be other tourists present, but this does not necessitate that one

have a social experience while climbing up the Tower to gaze out over the city.

The role of the co-tourist, however, necessitates shared experiences and interaction. The role of the tourist cannot be accomplished without the other, the co-tourist. In addition to being co-present the co-tourist not only shares in the consumption ritual of the tourist activity, but interacts. If the co-tourist is not present and there is an absence of interaction, then the tourist can not accomplish her role. The metaphor of the game helps to explain the concept of co-tourism.

In order to play a game other players must not only be present, but there must be substantial interaction among the players in order for the game to occur. If a player refuses to follow the game appropriate script, then the game breaks down. The failure of one player to fulfill her role in the game prevents other players from assuming their roles. All of the players have a similar interest in keeping the game going and a similar goal, namely the end of the game. In addition to knowing how to play the game—the script or the rules—players must be at or about the same level in skill for the game to proceed. Having professional baseball players take the field against little leaguers might be interesting (for a few minutes), but would not result in facilitating the goal, the end of the game.

The co-tourist thus differs from the traditional tourist who is typified by the gaze and the post-tourist who can be understood in the context of the theater (not through interaction with other social actors, but in the role of a member of the audience—as in 'doing' the theater). The co-tourist also differs from the traditional tourist in the search for authenticity as well as the post-tourist who revels in staged authenticity. Since the co-tourist is configured around interaction with other tourists—forming tourist dyads—she can be found in both authentic and staged spaces (Table 2). It is not the space that characterizes the tourist (although the space cannot impede the formation of relationships), but what happens within that space.

The co-tourist

Theorists within the paradigm have long argued for the democratization of tourism (Urry, 1990; Shaw and Williams, 1994; Williams and Shaw, 1998) Such that tourism and leisure are now seen as a right. Even those theorists who have expanded on the niche segmentation of the tourist market, now claim that those niches are becoming democratized (Ioannides and Debbage, 1998; Torres, 2002) While the advantage of this work is that it considers both production and

consumption, it lacks an interactional approach to consumption and has surprisingly disregarded the act of status differentiation inherent to consumption.

The markers (MacCannell, 1976) that tourists have traditionally used to provide evidence of their ability to occupy the role of tourist no longer signify conspicuous consumption. In an age marked by the flow of media images and the omnipresent internet, the proof that one has been there, done that, seeks a higher authority. Thus evidence of conspicuous consumption and status are more easily achieved by the practices and patterns inherent to the tourist role. The public nature of tourism makes the tourist role a highly visible one and as such easily marked from everyday behavior (which becomes unmarked)[3]. Part of this marking is the classificatory nature of cultural practices and patterns (Lamont and Lareau, 1988) which signifies status. While it is our contention that the consumption of goods no longer easily signifies status, we agree with Lamont and Lareau (1988) who believe that it is likely that cultural exclusion (and by corollary inclusion) frequently occurs and that status boundaries are still important. That tourist practices as an extension of everyday practices, which include status differentiation or tourist roles as marked and hence different from the unmarked everyday role, would not reproduce status boundaries seems improbable.

Increasingly tourist spaces are being developed where the co-presence of other tourists is necessary to fulfill the role of the tourist. In these spaces other tourists, co-tourists, either provide cultural scripts or simply participate in the interactional milieux that facilitate the role. The ability to participate in the milieux or provide the correct script is inherent to the possession of cultural capital. Insufficient stocks of capital result in the inability for members of the group to continue in the tourist role and consequently a break in tourism. However, because of the cultural capital necessary to interact with other tourists and fulfill the role of the co-tourist, boundary play rarely occurs. Boundary play occurs when tourists with contrasting levels of cultural capital can interact with one another so that a tourist with a low level of cultural capital can go back and forth between tourist spaces that require little or a lot of cultural capital. The absence of this mobility is evidence for co-tourism.

The rebuilding of historical sailing vessels at Hardanger Fartoyvernester (Olsen, 2002) is a good example of co-tourism. Without tourists working together the vessels could never be built. Also, The Sierra Club allows tourists to work in groups under their National Outings program to help rebuild tourist sites. You volunteer ahead of time with friends and rebuild camp sites or hiking trails. Other examples involve

multi-day trekking and hiking packages where you are responsible for the well being of other tourists (climbing Machu Picchu with groups of tourists arranged by a tour company). Here tourists trade responsibilities such as cooking, setting up camp, or even guiding. In addition the Nation magazine promotes an annual cruise for its subscribers in order to facilitate interaction among individuals with a shared ideology. Yet the paradigmatic example of co-tourism is where a boundary is negotiated between groups with similar levels of cultural capital.

Co-tourism and sideways

Lamont and Laurea (1998) believe that the crossing of status boundaries often occurs and as such the hierarchy of signals used to demonstrate status is constantly negotiated. The (re)negotiation of these signals can be observed by examining practices surrounding class boundaries. A good example of a recent boundary within co-tourism has been the affect of the film *Sideways* on Santa Barbara wine country.

Santa Barbara has long been a tourist and leisure destination for oenophiles. For many years it has served as an alternative space to Napa. Santa Barbara was wine country for those who wanted to travel the back roads and go on self-guided trails. While Napa served as the landscape for tourists wanting to consume the iconic and traditional landscape of Californian wineries, Santa Barbara was the space for those who wanted a non-traditional trip to the wine country. Santa Barbara was toured by those who enjoyed speaking with the vintner and learning directly about the wine. It was where tourists who had *tourist capital* when it came to wine tasting also had the same cultural capital as other tourists and as such enjoyed meeting up with one another and talking about wine or similar vacations and experiences in Piedmont or the Southern Rhône. One *could* enjoy the space in solitude, but the real experience was in occupying the role of the co-tourist. Consuming and sharing the consumption ritual with other tourists with the same levels of cultural capital. In the last year, however, that has all changed.

Since its release in October 2004, the independent film *Sideways* has drastically changed the landscape of Santa Barbara's wine country. Oenophiles have been replaced at the Fess Parker Winery by tourists who gesture to the ominous spit bucket that played a prominent role in the film and mimic other scenes and discourse from the film. Wineries appearing in the film have had their entire stock sell out and to date 42,000 copies of "*Sideways*, the Map" have been handed to tourists so they can take in the wine country like Miles and Jack, the main characters in the film. A visit

to the site *santabarbaraca.com* details other attractions for tourists to Santa Barbara, but accessing the link quickly reveals that *Sideways* is Santa Barbara wine country and that Santa Barbara is *Sideways*. The terms have become synonymous. Thus, while a boon for the Santa Barbara tourist industry, especially the wine and restaurant sectors (several local restaurants were featured prominently in the film), tourists long familiar with Santa Barbara lament that their secret has been divulged.

The routinization of interaction within the space of Santa Barbara, including long lines at wineries, the popularization of *Sideways* maps, and recreating *Sideways* dialogue may be viewed as constraining the cultural capital of the original co-tourists, those who relied on the interaction to sustain their wine country experience. The routinization of space may attract some tourists (for different reasons) and repel others because a heavily routinized space is less agentive, it is no longer a space of soft-control. Thus what is interesting about Santa Barbara wine country is while it now repels the original co-tourists, it simultaneously promotes a new type of co-tourism.

In order to recapture the interactions once encountered in Santa Barbara wine country, original Santa Barbara co-tourists now go to San Luis Obispo or Arroyo Grande. However, other co-tourists, Lynes (1954) and Peterson and Kern's (1996) Middlebrow consumers, use Santa Barbara as a space of performance, as a game where they can act out the fantasy role of being in a film.

CONCLUSION

What we are witnessing today is not the democratization of tourism. Theorists who argue for the democratization of tourism supplant the increasing ability to travel with what is done while traveling. And perhaps more importantly, obfuscate the primary reasons for occupying the role of the tourist. Absent from this discussion of democratization has been the continuing importance of consumption for tourist studies and the differentiating act of consumption for status.

Tourists still activate and increase cultural capital, but today do so through interactions with other tourists who have the same lifestyle patterns and practices. Holt notes that LCCs (people with low levels of cultural capital) participate in consumption rituals that are in most cases collective in nature, "positioning one within an idioculture of [an]other" (1998:14). It is our contention that this occurs at all class levels and is

especially noticeable in the tourist role. The signifying act of shared consumption (Hogg *et al.*, 2000) and the interaction ritual (Goffman, 1982) of co-tourism distinguishes it as a unique form of tourism. It is not simply the co-presence of other tourists that marks co-tourism and co-tourists as different, but the social interaction of their tourist performances and practices.

While it is not our contention that the co-tourist is an emergent type of tourist, we do wish to emphasize the increasing popularity of the role of the co-tourist. Spaces that promote co-tourism, such as Santa Barbara, are becoming increasingly more visible in the tourist landscape. The policy implications resulting from individuals desiring to foster social capital through the role of the tourist will move the industry further from any recognizable position on the Fordist spectrum (Torres, 2002) and closer to an interactionist perspective. The social interaction among tourists has been a neglected point of study within the paradigm. It is our hope that in acknowledging the rise of co-tourism and the influence of the co-tourist we can begin to rectify this deficiency.

REFERENCES

Appadurai, A. (1986). *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London, Sage.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Brekhus, W. (1998). A Sociology of the Unmarked: Redirecting our Focus. *Sociological Theory*, Vol.16, pp. 34-51.

Byrne, D. (2001). *Understanding the Urban*. London, Palgrave.

Cairncross, F. (1997). *The Death of Distance: How the Communications Revolution Will Change Our Lives*. Cambridge, Harvard Business School Press.

Cohen, E. (1972). Toward a Sociology of International Tourism. *Social Research*, Vol.39, pp. 164-182.

Cohen, E. (2004). *Contemporary Tourism: Diversity and Change*. New York, Elsevier.

Conca, K. (2002). Consumption and environment in a global economy. In T. Princen, M. Maniates, K. Conca (Eds.) *Confronting Consumption*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Corrigan, P. (1997). *The Sociology of Consumption*. London, Sage Publications.

Crouch, D., Aronsson, L. and Wahlström, L. (2001). Tourist Encounters. *tourist studies*, Vol.1, No.1, pp. 253-270.

Edensor, T. (2001). Performing tourism, staging tourism: (Re)producing tourist space and practice. *tourist Studies*, Vol.1, No.1, pp.59-81.

Eisinger, P. (2000). The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class, *Urban Affairs Review*, Vol.35, No.3, pp. 316-333.

Eisinger, P. (2003). Reimagining Detroit. *City and Community*, Vol.2, No.2, pp. 85-99.

Evans, G. (2001). *Cultural Planning: an urban renaissance?* New York, Routledge.

Featherstone, M. (1987). Lifestyle and Consumer Culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol.4, No.1, pp.55-70.

Feifer, M. (1986). *Tourism in History*. New York, Stein and Day.

Franklin, A. and Crang, M. (2001). The trouble with tourism and travel theory. *tourist studies*, Vol.1, No. 1, pp. 5-22.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. California, Stanford University Press.

Goffman, E. (1982). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face to Face Behavior*. New York, Pantheon.

Hiernaux-Nicolas, D. (2003). Tourism and strategic competitiveness: Infrastructure Development in Mexico City. In D. Judd (Ed.) *The Infrastructure of Play: Building the Tourist City*. New York, M.E. Sharpe.

Hogg, M., Cox, A. and Keeling, K. (2000). The Impact of Self-Monitoring on Image Congruence and Product/Brand Evaluation. *European Journal of Marketing* Vol.34, No.(5/6), pp. 641-666.

Holt, D. (1995). How consumers consume: A typology of consumption practices. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.22, pp.1-16.

Holt, D. (1997a). Distinction in America?: Recovering Bourdieu's theory of tastes from its critics. *Poetics*, Vol.25, pp.93-120.

Holt, D. (1997b). Poststructuralist lifestyle analysis: Conceptualizing the social patterning of consumption in postmodernity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.23, pp.326-350.

Holt, D. (1998). Does cultural capital structure American consumption? *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.5, pp.1-25.

Ioannides, D. and Debbage, K. (1998). Neo-Fordism and Flexible Specialization in the Travel Industry: Dissecting the Polygot. In D. Ioannides and K. Debbage (Eds.) *The Economic Geography of the Tourist Industry: A Supply-Side Analysis*. New York, Routledge.

Judd, D. (2003). *The Infrastructure of Play: Building the Tourist City*. New York, M.E. Sharpe.

Lacy, J. and Douglass, W. (2002). Beyond authenticity: The meanings and uses of cultural tourism. *tourist studies*, Vol.2, No.1, pp. 5-21.

Lamont, M. and Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments. *Sociological Theory*, Vol.6, No.2, pp. 153-168.

Law, C. (2002). Urban Destinations as Industrial Growth Clusters. In K. Wöber (Ed.) *City Tourism 2002*. New York, SpringerWien.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Oxford, Blackwell.
Lynes, R. (1954). *The Tastemakers*. New York, Harper.
MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings. *American Journal of Sociology* Vol.79, pp.589-603.
MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of Leisure Class*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
MacCannell, D. (2001). Tourist Agency. *tourist studies*, Vol.1, No.1, pp.23-37.
Meethan, K. (2001). *Tourism in Global Society: Place, Culture, Consumption*. New York, Palgrave.
Milne, S. (1998). Tourism and Sustainable Development: Exploring the Global-local Nexus. In C.M. Hall and A. Lew (Eds.) *Sustainable Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*. NewYork, Longman.
Milne, S. and Ateljevic, I. (2001). Tourism, Economic Development and the Global-local Nexus: Theory Embracing Complexity. *Tourism Geographies*, Vol.3, No.4, pp.363-393.
Nippert-Eng, C. (2005). Boundary Play. *Space and Culture*, Vol. 8, No.4, pp. 302-324.
Olsen, K. (2002). Authenticity as a concept in tourism research. *Tourist studies*, Vol.2, No.2, pp. 159-182.
Peterson, R. (1997). The rise and fall of highbrow snobbery as a status marker. *Poetics*, Vol.25, pp.75-92.
Peterson, R. and Kern, R. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review*, Vol.61, pp. 900-907.
Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization Thesis: Explorations and Extensions*. California, Pine Forge Press.
Ritzer, G. (1999). *Enchanting A Disenchanted World: Revolutionizing the Means of Consumption*. California, Pine Forge Press.
Ritzer, G. (2004). *The Globlization of Nothing*. California, Pine Forge Press.
Ritzer, G. and Liska, A. (1997). McDisenyization and Post-Tourism: Complimentary Perspectives on Contemporary Tourism. In C. Rojek and J. Urry (Eds.) *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London, Routledge.
Rojek, C. (1995). *Decentring Leisure: Rethinking Leisure Theory*. London, Sage.
Rojek, C. (2000). *Leisure and Culture*. London, Macmillan.
Rojek, C. and Urry, J. (1997). *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel Theory*. New York, Routledge.
Schor, J. (1998). *The Overspent American*. New York, Harper Perennial.
Seaton, A.V. (1994). *Tourism: The State of the Art*. Chichester, England, Wiley.
Shaw, G. and Williams, A. (1994). *Critical Issues in Tourism. A Geographical Perspective*. Oxford, Blackwell.
Sherlock, K. (2001). Revisiting the concept of hosts and guests. *tourist studies*, Vol.1, No.3, pp. 271-295.
Smith, V. (1977). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.
Simmel, G. (1957). Fashion. *American Journal of Sociology* 62, 541-548.

Tomlinson, A. (1990). *Consumption, Identity and Style: Marketing, Meanings, and the Packaging of Pleasure*. New York, Routledge.
Torres, R. (2002). Cancun's tourism development from a Fordist spectrum of analysis. *Tourist studies*, Vol.2, No.1, pp.87-116.
Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze*. California, Sage Publications.
Urry, J. (1992). The Tourist Gaze Revisited. *American Behavorial Scientist*, Vol.36, pp.172-186.
Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming Places*. New York, Routledge.
Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. New York, Routledge.
Veblen, T. (1994). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Dover Publications, New York.
Warner, L. (1949). *Social Class in America: The Evaluation of Status*. Harper Torch-Books, New York.
Williams, A. and Shaw, G. (1998). Tourism and the Environment: Sustainability and Economic Restructuring? In C.M. Hall and A. Lew (Eds.) *Sustainable Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*. New York, Longman.
Wöber, K. (2002). *City Tourism 2002*. New York, SpringerWein.

ENDNOTES

1. The exception of course being the enablement inherent in the host/guest relationship (see Smith, 1977; more recently, Sherlock, 2001) and the development of the tourist infrastructure (see Seaton, 1994; more recently, Eisinger, 2000, 2003)
2. For a comprehensive discussion of the difference between post-Fordist and neo-Fordist tourism see Torres (2002).
3. For an excellent discussion of marked and unmarked see Brekhus (1998).

SUBMITTED: SEPTEMBER 2005
REVISION SUBMITTED: JANUARY 2006
ACCEPTED: MARCH 2006
REFEREED ANONYMOUSLY

Daina Cheyenne Harvey (dharvey@rutgers.edu) is a Lecturer at Rutgers University, Department of Sociology, 54 Joyce Kilmer Avenue, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8045, USA.

Janet Lorenzen (jlorenzen@rutgers.edu) is a Lecturer at Rutgers University, Department of Sociology, 54 Joyce Kilmer Avenue, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8045, USA.