اينستيتوت ڤڠاجين اسيان

INSTITUTE OF
ASIAN STUDIES

Emerging Tourisms and Tourism Studies in Southeast Asia

Victor T. King

Universiti Brunei Darussalam

Working Paper No. 35

Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam

Gadong 2017

Author

Victor T. King is Emeritus Professor at the University of Leeds; Professorial Research Associate, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London; and Professor of Borneo Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam-Institute of Asian Studies. He has long-standing research interests in the sociology and anthropology of Southeast Asia, ranging over such diverse fields as social and cultural change, development, tourism and heritage, ethnicity and identity, multidisciplinary regional studies, and museum and photographic studies. Among his recent publications are an edited book *UNESCO in Southeast Asia: World Heritage Sites in Comparative Perspective* (2016), and five co-edited books: *Rethinking Asian Tourism: Culture, Encounters and Local Response* (with Ploysri Porananond, 2014); *Tourism and Monarchy in Southeast Asia* (with Ploysri Porananond, 2016); *Human Insecurities in Southeast Asia* (with Paul J. Carnegie and Zawawi Ibrahim, 2016); *Borneo Studies in History, Society and Culture* (with Zawawi Ibrahim and Hasharina Hassan, 2017); and *Tourism and Ethnodevelopment: Inclusion, Empowerment and Self-determination* (with Ismar Borges de Lima, 2017).

Contact: v.t.king@leeds.ac.uk; victor.king@ubd.edu.bn

Emerging Tourisms and Tourism Studies in Southeast Asia

Victor T. King

Abstract:

The field of tourism studies is now addressing a range of issues which in part stem from the problems engendered by multi-disciplinary approaches and from the post-modernist, post-colonialist, post-structuralist criticisms that its priorities and concepts have been determined by a Western-centric (Euro-American) view of the world of tourism. In this regard comparisons are made in this paper between tourism studies and area studies (specifically Southeast Asian Studies). Both suffer from some of the same difficulties. From this comparative perspective, it is suggested that we engage critically with unhelpful binary modes of thinking which have sought to distinguish between the West, and in this case the East, between Western-centred and Eastern-centred perspectives, and between insiders and outsiders. The issue of "emerging tourisms" only serves to complicate these matters. How do studies of tourism accommodate novel tourisms? Do we view them as simply variations on a theme which can be addressed within existing conceptual frameworks? Is a "mobilities" or an "encounters" approach sufficiently robust and viable to handle apparent touristic innovations? In an Asian and Southeast Asian context does the issue of emerging tourisms in this region require us to re-engage with debates about Orientalism and Western academic hegemony?

Keywords: *emerging tourisms, multi-disciplinarity, Southeast Asian Studies, binaries, Orientalism, Occidentalism*

List of IAS Working Papers

1. King, Victor T., Culture and Identity: Some Borneo Comparisons. Working Paper No. 1 Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2012.
2. Evers, Hans-Dieter and Solvay Gerke, Local Knowledge and the Digital Divide: Focus on Southeast Asia. Working Paper No. 2. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2012.
3. King, Victor T., Borneo and Beyond: Reflections on Borneo Studies, Anthropology and the Social Sciences. Working Paper No. 3. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013.
4. King, Victor T., UNESCO in Southeast Asia: World Heritage Sites in Comparative Perspective. Working Paper No. 4. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013.
5. Purwaningrum, Farah, Knowledge Transfer Within an Industrial Cluster in the Jakarta Metropolitan Area. Working Paper No. 5. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013.
6. Evers, Hans-Dieter, Ndah, Anthony Banyouko & Yahya, Liyana, Epistemic Landscape Atlas of Brunei Darussalam. Working Paper No. 6. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013.
7. Carnegie, Paul J., Is the Indonesian Transition a Model for the Arab Spring? Working Paper No. 7. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013.
8. Lian, Kwen Fee, Citizenship Regimes and the Politics of Difference in Southeast Asia. Working Paper No. 8. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2013.
9. Purwaningrum, Farah, Ariff Lim, Syamimi, Evers, Hans-Dieter & Ndah, Anthony Banyouko, The Governance of Knowledge: Perspectives from Brunei Darussalam and Malaysia. Working Paper No. 9. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014.
10. Facal, Gabriel, Hyper-centralization of Political Power and Fragmentation of Local Authority Networks in Banten (Indonesia). Working Paper No.10. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014.
11. Hussainmiya, B.A. and Mail, Asbol Haji, "No Federation Please-We Are Bruneians": Scuttling the Northern Borneo Closer Association Proposals. Working Paper No.11. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014.
12. Abdul Hakim, Mufidah. Pengangun as Ritual Specialist in Brunei Darussalam. Working Paper No.12. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2014.
13. Bensaoud, Mariam. Between R2P and the ASEAN Way:The case of Myanmar's Cylcone Nargis. Working Paper No.13. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015.
14. Abdul Razak, Nurul Umillah Binti, Anuar, Adira Rehafizzan Binti, Pg. Mohd Sahar, Dk. Siti Nurul Islam Binti & Matsuni, Nur Hidayah Binti. Domestic Maids in Brunei: A Case Study. Working Paper No.14. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015.
15. Ibrahim, Zawawi. From Island to Nation-state Formations and Developmentalism: Penan Story-telling as Narratives of 'territorialising space' and Reclaiming Stewardship. Working Paper No.15. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015.

16. Bui, Cuong The. Social Stratification in the Southeast Region of Viet Nam. Working Paper No. 16 Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015.
17. Sagoo, Kiran. Reconsidering Ethnicity: Classification and Boundary Formation. Working Paper No. 17. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015.
18. Ibrahim, Zawawi. Disciplining Rock Music and Identity Contestations: Hybridization, Islam and New Musical Genres in Contemporary Malaysian Popular Music. Working Paper No.18. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015.
19. Shui, Kong Ho. Digital Memoir of the South China Sea. Working Paper No. 19. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2015.
20. Ullah, AKM Ahsan; Yusof, Yusnani Mohamed; D'Aria, Maria. How safe is Safe? 'Safe migration' in Southeast Asia. Working Paper No. 20. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
21. Oishi, Mikio. Co-existing Differences: Towards an East Asian Way Of Incompatibility Mangement. Working Paper No. 21. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
22. Carnegie, Paul J. Of Social Imaginary and Violence: Responding to Islamist Militancy in Indonesia. Working Paper No. 22. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
23. Rosidi, Imron. Being Active Consumers: Indonesian Muslim Youth Engaging With Korean Television Dramas. Working Paper No. 23. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
24. King, Victor T. Convergence and Divergence: Issues of State and Region in Tourism Development in Malaysian Borneo, Brunei Darussalam and Indonesian Kalimantan. Working Paper No. 24. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
25. Dhont, Frank, Marles, Jane E. & Jukim, Maslin. Memories of World War II: Oral History of Brunei Darussalam (Dec. 1941-June 1942). Working Paper No. 25. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
26. Chu, Ta-Wei. Contestation between Riparian People and States: The Sesan River Hydropower Projects, Cambodia. Working Paper No. 26. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
27. Nugroho, S. Post-Authoritarian Discourses of "Indonesia" in Television Commercials. Working Paper No. 27. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2016.
28. Hamdi, Muhammad Faiz Zul, Abdullah, Norhidayah, and Narudin, Hazimatula Diyana. Space, Place, and Identity: How Migration have Transformed Kampong Ayer. Working Paper No. 28. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.
29. Chin, Wei Lee. Tourism, Communities, and Quality of Life Indicators in Bali. Working Paper No. 29. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.
30. Jetin, Bruno. "One Belt-One Road Initiative" and ASEAN Connectivity: Synergy Issues and Potentialities. Working Paper No. 30. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.
31. Maier, Hendrik M.J. Silent the Sea, Writing the Shores – Traveling over the South China Sea. Working Paper No. 31. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.

32. Hoon, Chang-Yau. Between Hybridity and Identity: Chineseness as a Cultural Resource in Indonesia. Working Paper No. 32. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.
33. Forbes, Vivian Louis. Re-framing the South China Sea: Geographical Reality and Historical Fact and Fiction. Working Paper No. 33. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.
34. Oishi, Mikio. Absorbing External Shocks: ASEAN's Approach to Regional Stubility. Working Paper No. 34. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.
35. King, Victor T. Emerging Tourisms and Tourism Studies in Southeast Asia. Working Paper No. 35. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam 2017.

Emerging Tourisms and Tourism Studies in Southeast Asia

Victor T. King[1]

INTRODUCTION

Classification

Many observers have pointed to the classificatory impulse and to the preoccupation with the formulation and demarcation of categories in tourism studies. In this paper, I focus on sociological and anthropological contributions to our understanding of tourism, and though the study of tourism comprises a multi-disciplinary field of enquiry, researchers from other disciplines (politics, economics, history, geography, management and business) might perceive and define the world of tourism rather differently. However, I would argue that most of the conceptual innovations in the study of tourism have derived primarily from the disciplines of sociology and anthropology, followed by political economy and history. Classification, along with the definition and naming of categories of tourist and associated tourism activities are of course necessary, especially in the earlier stages of research to address and seek order out of complexity (see, for example, Cohen, 1972, 1979a, 1979b, 1984). But they also serve analytically to essentialise what are seen to be the different characteristics of tourism, behaviour, motivation, and its consequences (Franklin and Crang, 2001: 6; King, 2015). The danger is that classification becomes an end in itself; in other words, those who classify, especially in an ever-expanding field of tourism studies, tend to devise and elaborate ever more expansive typologies, grids, taxonomies, templates and frameworks and increase the range of categories and subdivisions as a means of grasping, comprehending and

[1] This paper was presented as a keynote address at an international conference on 'Emerging Tourism in the Changing World' organised by the Center for Tourism Research at Chiang Mai University, Thailand, on 12-13 November 2016. This is a much revised and extended version of the paper.

controlling the phenomena under investigation. From relatively simple, often binary distinctions (host-guest; mass-alternative; adventure-beach/cruise; business-pleasure) schemes then subsequently became more extended with regard to tourism types ([ethnic, cultural, historical, environmental, recreational] or [culture, ethnic, history, heritage, nature/ecotourism, rural/farm-based, personal development, health, visiting friends/family, social status, recreation]) or tourist types ([organised mass tourist, individual mass tourist, explorer, drifter] or [adventurers, worriers, dreamers, economisers, indulgers] or [explorers, elite tourists, off-beat tourists, unusual tourists, incipient mass tourists, mass tourists, charter tourists] or [backpackers; empty nesters, children gone; double income no kids (dinks); single income no kids (sinks); early/active retirees; late/senior retirees; boomers, youth]). Of course, typologies have a useful role to play. But as Burns concluded some time ago 'While each of these typologies has added something to our understanding of tourists [and tourism], it becomes obvious on analysing them that they add very little deeper understanding of tourists [tourism]' (1999: 46). Burns captures precisely the dilemma that the emerging field of tourism studies had to address in the late 1970s and the 1980s.

Emerging tourisms

There are problems in defining what we mean by 'emerging'. But the underlying assumption must be that, in some way, the concept applies to novel kinds of tourism activity. However, this might apply to a site or sites which are new to tourism and have adopted and developed tourisms which are well-established elsewhere (Myanmar might be a case in point, or some other parts of mainland Southeast Asia in the Lao PDR, Cambodia and Vietnam). The notion of 'emerging' might be used to explore the behaviour of tourists who have become only relatively recently engaged in international tourism activities (Chinese tourists in Chiang Mai for example). On the other hand, in a recent international conference on 'Emerging Tourisms in the Changing World' organised by the Centre for Tourism Research and the Research Administration Centre (RAC) at Chiang Mai University, Thailand, 12-13 November, 2016, participants presented a range of tourisms which were considered to be, in some sense, new: disaster tourism in Japan and Indonesia; battlefield tourism in Vietnam; *halal* tourism in Japan (this is presumably a matter of the kind of tourism as well as the site, and the same might be said of *halal* tourism in Thailand); slum tourism (in South Korea); food or gastronomic tourism (in Malaysia); extended travel and sojourning (in South Korea and Japan); road-race event tourism (in Taiwan); volunteer tourism (in Malaysia, Thailand

and the wider Asia); folklore and educational tourism (with reference to Indonesian students); luxury travel (in India and Mexico); health-related and medical tourism (in Thailand, Malaysia, India and China); wildlife photographic tourism (in Thailand); and trans-border ecotourism, heritage tourism, food tourism, and ethnic and cultural tourism (in Myanmar, Thailand, the Lao PDR and southern China).

But what seems to me to be worth exploring are the ways in which certain forms of apparently new tourism activities have been inserted into established forms, or have simply been repackaged, and advertised and promoted as something, in tourism terms, that is new. What we might previously have referred to as 'alternative' or 'niche' or 'sustainable' tourism, as set against mass tourism or package tourism, now appears on websites in more dramatic forms as 'strange', 'weird' (Toptenz, 2016), 'bizarre' (List 25, 2016), or 'curious' (Curiousmatic, 2016).

These categories referred to above were accessed at random under such internet searches as 'emerging', 'alternative', 'unusual', or 'strange' tourisms. What is noticeable is that there is some overlap between the lists, that some types of tourism hardly seem to be analytically viable or meaningful categories; some are established forms of tourism whether mass or alternative, or a sub-category or element of a wider category; others do not seem to be new or emerging, though they might be seen as more recent variations on a theme; and some do not appear to be usefully included as a type of tourism at all, though obviously they involve mobility. However, what is also clear is the strong inclination to increase the types or categories of tourism in a post-modern, fragmented, ad hoc way. A cursory survey of the relevant websites also reveals that there is also an attempt to explain this increase in emerging tourisms in terms of technological development, the ways in which the modern, highly competitive tourism industry expands and promotes its markets and clientele, and as responses to pressures on the environment and on established tourist sites.

Listed below are a selection of apparently novel tourisms accessed from the internet under the headings of 'weird', 'bizarre', 'curious', 'strange' or 'emerging'. They require further analysis, but here I place them in three major categories to question in some cases their novelty or weirdness or whether they qualify as tourism at all, or whether then can simply be lumped together as a specialist sub-category under wider-established categories; this then leaves a few cases, in my view, which might qualify as emerging tourisms.

(1) **well established in the tourism literature and do not warrant the terms weird or bizarre**: sustainable/ecotourism; domestic tourism; rural/agritourism; food/gastronomic/culinary/booze/enotourism; volunteer/educational tourism; *halal* tourism; business tourism; gay tourism; battlefield tourism; gambling tourism; long-stay/retirement tourism; religious tourism; sports tourism; health/ wellness/medical tourism; recently- and long-dead celebrity tourism; home-stay tourism; festival/fiesta tourism;

(2) **those that either (a) may not be usefully seen as tourism as such or (b) are sub-categories of wider tourism activity**: (a) benefit tourism; fertility/birth tourism; suicide tourism; illegal immigrant tourism; protest tourism; slow tourism; (b) shark tourism; dental tourism; Christian tourism; drug/ghetto/homeless/stag party tourism; garden tourism; genealogy tourism; Tolkien tourism; soccer tourism; bungee-jumping/sky-diving tourism; crossword/bridge/painting tourism;

(3) **those that might qualify as emerging tourisms or new/novel tourisms**; space tourism; doom/dark/disaster/extinction/war/atomic tourism.

Let us move on to consider whether these categorisations of emerging tourisms (and the fact that it could be argued that some of them may misleadingly be placed under the umbrella of tourism and therefore shade into a more amorphous concept of travel and mobility) require re-conceptualisation. Here we enter an arena of difficulty.

The Multi-Disciplinary Study of Southeast Asia/Asia and Orientalism

My long-standing involvement in the multi-disciplinary fields of area or regional studies, especially Southeast Asian/Asian Studies, and tourism studies suggests parallels between them and raises problems about how, why and where we draw boundaries around these arenas of academic endeavour. In my view, the field of tourism studies suffers from some of the same problems as other multi-disciplinary fields of study; a major issue comprises the question of where our main concepts are generated and who generates them. This then entails a consideration of the problematical relationships between multi-disciplinary and disciplinary studies and the issue of dialogue across disciplinary boundaries and what I have referred to elsewhere as the insider-outsider dichotomy or binary (King, 2016a).

Multi-disciplinary studies have been and continue to be criticised for perceived weaknesses in conceptualisation and in methodology (King, 2006, 2014). This applies particularly to regional studies, perhaps rather less so to tourism studies where multi-disciplinary approaches are less of an issue; the study of tourism is a more recent academic phenomenon, and the relative strength of academic disciplines is much greater. In this regard, perhaps the field of tourism studies and its rationale should be questioned, as it has been questioned more recently, mainly from sociological and anthropological perspectives (see, for example, Cohen and Cohen, 2012a, 2015a, 2015b).

Orientalism and Occidentalism

In regard to the study of Southeast Asia/Asia, whether in the field of tourism or more widely across the social sciences and the humanities, there have been sustained critical interventions by mainly Asian-based scholars who make reference to Western-centred Orientalism and the dominance of Euro-American perspectives, interests, experiences and priorities. In both the case of tourism and area studies there has also been a tendency to set up an insider-outsider dichotomy or binary in the call for the increasing indigenisation of scholarship. In other words, the charge is that Southeast Asia/Asia has been constructed by outsiders as has the study of tourism in the region.

In regard to the insider-outsider binary reference is invariably made to Edward Said's thesis on Orientalism (1978; and see 1993). However, these debates were already under way in Southeast Asia before Said's work, and they began to be articulated as far back as the mid-1950s in the work of Syed Hussein Alatas in his developing notion of the 'captive mind' in the context of 'academic imperialism' (1956: 52; 1972, 1974). Syed Hussein Alatas progressively emphasised the negative consequences of local scholarly dependence on the West (1974) and of the colonial construction of indigenous Southeast Asian populations (1977, 1979, 2000). It was then conceptualised more generally in global social science terms by Syed Farid Alatas, following his father, Syed Hussein, in consistently presenting the case for 'alternative discourses' (2006a). Over twenty years ago Syed Farid stated that 'The institutional and theoretical dependence of Third World scholars on Western social science has resulted in what has been referred to as the captive mind [which] is uncritical and imitative in its approach to ideas and concepts from the West' (1993: 307). We might refer to this sustained critique of the Western academy from Asian scholars as 'Occidentalism', and as an Asian construction of Western research on Asia.

Syed Farid Alatas isolated several issues in the problematical engagement of local scholarship (insider) with Western (outsider) academic hegemony, relating this back to Indian criticisms of colonialism from the late eighteenth century; but he chose to concentrate on debates from the 1970s when the concept of 'indigenization' began to be consolidated, especially in the disciplines of anthropology, psychology and sociology (2005: 227). The problems he identifies for local scholarship arising from this hegemony are: a lack of creativity; mimesis; essentialism; absence of subaltern voices; and an alignment with the state (2005: 229; 2001: 50; 2003; 2000, 2004). His call for alternative discourses is rooted in the identification of an 'academic dependency' which demands 'the critique of the Eurocentric, imitative, elitist and irrelevant social science' imposed from the West (2005: 230). In identifying non-Western exemplars in the development of an autonomous sociology he examines the work of Ibn Khaldun and Jose Rizal (2009). His recent paper on the theme of 'doing sociology in Southeast Asia' extends his argument that in the era of a 'new Orientalism' there has been 'a neglect and silencing of non-Western voices'; they have been marginalised (2015: 192; and see 2009; and Alatas and Sinha, 2001)

More recently several prominent Southeast Asian academics have argued that what is needed in the study of Southeast Asia is to 'decentre' and 'diversify' studies of the region to address 'local dimensions', 'local priorities' and "local", and 'indigenous voices' (Goh, 2011a:1, 20011b). This builds on Ariel Heryanto's criticism of research on Southeast Asia in that, in his view, it has 'an exogenous character' (2002: 3; and 2007). He posed the question 'Can there be Southeast Asians in Southeast Asian Studies?' and drew attention to the 'subordinate or inferior position [of Southeast Asians] within the production and consumption of this enterprise' (2002: 4). In turn, and as we have seen, the perspective which calls for indigenisation, which Ariel Heryanto presented forcefully had been enunciated a long time ago. What was being proposed was the need for a locally relevant discourse which incorporated and expressed indigenous viewpoints, histories, cultures, and experiences. Eric Thompson too, based in Singapore, has been critical of Western authors, myself included, who have failed to give due recognition to 'emergent national traditions' in locally generated anthropological research in Southeast Asia (2012: 664-689; and see 2008).

While I have some sympathy with these arguments for a greater emphasis on local scholarship, interests and priorities (see, for example Porananond and King, 2014 on tourism

research in Asia), I do not think the insider-outsider (Western-Eastern) dichotomy can be substantiated, at least not during the past 15 to 20 years of research (King, 2016a: 17). The so-called Euro-American (and Australian?) or Western hegemony is diverse and increasingly fragmented. Adrian Vickers has already suggested in relation to Edward Said's thesis that 'identifying "Orientalism" as a single discourse about "the East" is extremely questionable' (2009: 64); and Grant Evans poses the question '[W]hich is the "real West"?' (2005: 51). Even Syed Farid Alatas qualifies his argument by stating that not all Western scholars are 'necessarily Eurocentric' and that Eurocentrism is not confined to Europeans and Americans (2015: 196).

There has also been an enormous growth in research and scholarship within the region undertaken significantly by local scholars, but also by non-local though locally-based scholars, especially in Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines, but increasingly in Cambodia, the Lao PDR, Vietnam and Brunei, with notable advances in Myanmar. Importantly there is also a considerable contribution on Southeast Asia and the wider Asia by researchers in neighbouring mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea and Japan. In East Asia, a significant proportion of publications is written in the local vernaculars, and Japan with its former colonies in Taiwan, Korea, Manchuria and Micronesia and its emphasis on publishing in Japanese has always been something of an independent centre of scholarship separate from the West and Southeast Asia (Ben-Ari and van Bremen, 2005:2). These Asian constituencies are also varied in their academic histories, backgrounds, characteristics, interests, priorities and perspectives and are not easily lumped together. Furthermore, neither local scholars nor those from outside (if we can make these distinctions) 'have unambiguous advantages' (Evans, 2005: 51).

Further, Evans has argued in a book on Asian anthropology, which is a view I share, that 'We do not need an indigenous or indigenized anthropology in Asia, or anywhere else, but an anthropology which is more self-consciously and sensitively internationalized' (2005: 53). Similarly, Eyal Ben-Ari and Jan van Bremen, in their editorial introduction to the book, drew attention to the difficulties of differentiating categories of insider and outsider and called for a re-conceptualisation of the professional hierarchies of 'centers and peripheries', given the shifting, fluid nature of scholarship and its globalised character (2005: 9-10, 28-30). They also refer to the fact that, in academic research, national and regional distinctions though identifiable, should not neglect the existence of 'common expertise and professional rules and procedures' (2005: 19).

Shinji Yamashita has also examined the complexities, in an interconnected scholarly world, of distinguishing between 'foreign', 'native' and 'indigenous' anthropologies (2004: 1-34).

Returning to the indigenisation discourse, it is by no means clear to me what position Syed Farid Alatas takes. He states that the case for alternative discourses and a 'more relevant social science' does not require 'a total rejection of Western social science' because it is important to acknowledge 'social science as a universal discourse' (2005: 230, 234, 240; and 2004: 69). What he appears to require from Western social science is the 'selective adaptation of it to local needs' (2005: 240). Insofar as I understand the argument he seems to be recommending additions, adaptations, and local contextualisation, but, to my mind, this is not an alternative discourse. It is a modified, qualified, conditional discourse which also addresses 'indigenous viewpoints'. Therefore, I assume, we are not engaged in proposals for alternative paradigms, or theories, perhaps not even alternative concepts. But even this interpretation of his argument is rather uncertain when Alatas states that 'there has been little by way of indigenized anthropological theories and concepts' (2005: 238; and see 2006b). On the one hand, it seems he is recommending or at least wishes for alternative paradigms; on the other he seems to be content with locally contextualised discourses and selective adaptation.

The same can be said of Goh Beng Lan's position (2011a, 2011b, 2014). She argues for the importance of Southeast Asia in global terms, for the vitality of scholarship within the region and for the contribution of local scholars to understanding their own region. I happily concur with her views. She also emphasises the importance of situating knowledge production in a Southeast Asian context, but then addresses the distinctions and mutually enriching interactions between locally generated (insider) and Euro-American-[Australian]-derived (outsider) interests, perspectives and approaches. Here she proposes a continuing dialogue between the Southeast Asian academy and the West.

She says, and this is undeniable, that the 'compiled narratives of regional humanities and social science practices … show an undeniable influence of Western disciplinary and epistemology-cum-methodology traditions'. However, in the same vein as Syed Farid Alatas she adds that 'despite the operations of generic Western human science, there are distinct dimensions to human sciences within the region' (2014: 29). She continues in that 'as much as newer critical norms are warranted in reforming Euro-American models of area studies, it would be a mistake to

presume their universal relevance to other formulations outside the West' (2014: 29; 2011a: 8-9). Yet these practices are rarely spelled out in detail and they certainly do not, insofar as I have been able to discern them, constitute a major paradigm or theoretical shift in the social sciences and humanities. We are therefore addressing adjustments, additions and qualifications, and not a substantial transformation in the way in which Southeast Asia has been described, analysed and constructed since the late 1940s.

Eurocentrism/Anglo-Western-Centrism in Tourism Research: 'Asia on Tour' and the 'Asian Wave'

An observation on research on Asian tourism and specifically Southeast Asian tourism in the last 15 years or so must direct our attention to the increasing interest in the characteristics, behaviour, and effects of intra-Asian tourism, the underlying tourist motivations generated in regional travel, and the importance of addressing the 'domestication' of tourism (see, for example, Chang, 2015; Singh, 2009/2011; Teo and Chang, 1998; Teo, Chang and Ho, 2001; Winter, 2007: 27-44; 2009a: 315-324; 2009b: 21-31; Winter, Teo and Chang, 2009a, 2009b).

The direction and tone of the debate is very much in line with the criticisms outlined above of the Orientalist cum Euro-American-centric construction of Southeast Asia/Asia. Winter, though not an insider, has called persuasively for more attention to 'the ongoing rise of Asian tourism' and that this process has rendered research on intra-Asian and domestic tourism 'institutionally and intellectually ill equipped to understand and interpret the new era we are now entering' (2009b: 21; and see Alneng, 2002: 119-142; Nyiri 2006, 2009: 153-169). The shift to a focus on Asians on tour in Asia also requires researchers 'to ask unfamiliar and important questions... [and] to address the analytical imbalances that characterize tourism studies today' (Winter, Teo and Chang, 2009b: 2).

A difference between the area studies and the tourism studies debate seems to me to be that the main proponents of indigenisation are scholars from outside the region, for example, Tim Winter, Victor Alneng, Pal Nyiri, Erik Cohen and Scott Cohen (2012a, 2014a, 2014b, 2015), and not from within, although Peggy Teo, T.C. Chang and Brenda Yeoh in Singapore have pressed the case for Asianisation as has Ploysri Porananond in Thailand. Winter has probably been the most persistent in pressing the case and in addressing universalistic assumptions about 'the tourist'

derived from preoccupations with Western tourism and the cultural and geographical biases generated by these preoccupations. The solutions, he suggests, are to encourage more scholarship on Asian tourism undertaken by Asian researchers to address the characteristics, experiences, encounters and motivations involved in intra-Asian and domestic tourism ('centring scholarship from Asia') and 'to create the institutional homes in Asia that support and promote critical perspectives' (2009a: 323-324; 2009b: 21-31). These are eminently sensible suggestions and ones which I would support unreservedly (see, for example, Porananond and King, 2014, 2016). The important corollary of this proposed shift in emphasis to the development of Asian scholarship on Asian tourism is that it should not confine itself primarily to matters of policy, management, and training in the tourism and hospitality industry, but instead address critical issues of power and marginality, representation and imaging, stakeholder interaction and local community involvement (Winter, 2009a: 325). Winter further recommends the writing of histories of Asian tourism and addressing imbalances between countries in Asia in terms of their level of tourism development and the scholarly attention devoted to them, and 'to raise the visibility of institutions and scholarship in smaller countries' (Winter, 2009a: 24-325). Again, these are well thought out and appropriate proposals in the context of current research trajectories in Asian tourism.

There is a final 'future direction' which is based on Winter's critical assessment that there has been "a widespread failure to look more closely and incorporate non-Western forms of leisure travel into the mainstream discussions and theories about tourism" (Winter, 2009a, p. 317). This observation derives directly from Syed Farid Alatas' 'instructive guidance' on 'alternative discourses', and for Winter the need 'to develop grounded theory'. Nevertheless, as Winter also admits, 'This is perhaps the trickiest issue of all' (Winter, 2009a: 322-323). What is more, Winter, Teo and Chang are uncertain whether Asian tourism experiences are 'qualitatively different' and are 'creating a series of distinct, even unique, cultural forms' (2009b: 9). Based on what has been provided for us in *Asia on Tour* and in Singh's *Domestic Tourism in Asia* (2009/2011) I would venture to suggest that, rather than new paradigms and alternative discourses, we can continue to address these tourism encounters and experiences in terms of the concepts currently available to us, although of course, where necessary, with suitable cross-cultural and contextual modification.

Winter's concluding remarks in *Asia on Tour* do not seem to give us a clear direction in seeking out alternative discourses and the means to develop grounded theory (see, for example,

Winter, 2009a: 322-323). I accept that we need to adjust our analytical lens to address Asian tourism in Asia, and I appreciate that local hosts may hold different perceptions of tourists of different nationalities and ethnicities, though not in all circumstances; that tourists of different ethnicities and different types may have different motivations, expectations and interests, and organize their visits in different ways; that various notions of modernity, self, status and power are generated, captured and reflected upon in the Asian tourism experience; that Asian visitors to other Asian countries may form different images of their hosts than Western tourists; that encounters between tourists and hosts who share broadly the same culture might be more likely to be thought of in terms of cultural affinity rather than ones which focus on difference and the exotic; that in domestic tourism the interaction between national and ethnic, local and provincial identities frequently comes into play; and that in a globalising and increasingly cosmopolitan world the distinctions between the domestic and the foreign are no longer clear-cut and, indeed, become increasingly complex. But do these considerations require theoretical and discursive innovations?

A most recent intervention in this Asianising mode is T.C. Chang's paper on 'The Asian Wave' (2015). He too expresses eloquently the need to address the rising tide of intra-Asian and domestic tourism in which Asians meet Asians, in which cultural affinity rather than cultural dissonance is more pronounced, and to move away from overly Eurocentric preoccupations. He suggests two ways forward in capturing more appropriately Asian experiences: the 'post-colonial approach' stemming from Critical Tourism Studies (CTS) which 're-configures traditional Western templates for Asian tourism' and the 'geography-matters perspective' which 'emphasises the importance of locality in mediating allegedly global forms of development' (2015: 83-84). In illustrating these approaches, he draws on case studies which demonstrate the differences between Asian and Western touristic encounters in Asian backpacking (see, for example, Teo and Leong, 2006) and theme parks and domestic tourism (see, for example, Teo and Yeoh, 2001). He also refers to Erik Cohen's and Scott Cohen's substantial and important work on Eurocentrism in tourism studies and their argument in favour of a paradigm shift to a 'mobilities' framework (2014a; and see 2012a, 2014b, 2015). However, it would seem from Chang's case material that, although he indicates cultural and geographical differences from Western tourist experiences, the analyses can be handled within existing conceptual frameworks and they do not require an alternative locally-generated paradigm. Indeed, Chang refers to his post-colonial and geography-

matters proposals as 'revisionist', using 'alternative indigenous insights'; so far as I can discern they do not constitute an alternative non-Western paradigm (2015: 83, 88).

Conceptual Issues: Alternative Discourses and Paradigms?

Erik Cohen and Scott Cohen draw attention to the context within which tourism activities and emerging tourisms are currently developing and transforming in a globalising world: the increasing pace of change; time-space compression; the saturation in information and images; the fragmentation of lifestyles; increasing risk, uncertainty and insecurity; pervasive consumerism and commoditisation; cultural pluralisation; and the de-differentiation of social domains (2012a: 2180). These processes also help explain the proliferation of emerging tourisms.

But there is a major question to be posed 'Do we need re-conceptualisation or conceptualisation anew to address the changing arenas of tourism?' My immediate response is 'No', neither do we require alternative discourses or paradigms. We can capture these changes and developments within our existing conceptual apparatus, though, in deploying it, we certainly need to take increasing account of intra-Asian and domestic tourism (King, 2015a, 2015b). What I have also argued is that our current concepts are not derived from a coming together of academic disciplines within a multi-disciplinary endeavour of tourism studies. There has been very little if any cross-disciplinary activity which has served to generate conceptual innovation, a criticism that has also been levelled at area studies, including Southeast Asian Studies. Calling into question the rationale and delimitation of tourism as a viable field of studies is nothing new for those involved in multi-disciplinary studies. After all, these studies which bring together and feed off disciplines have indeterminate and fluid boundaries. What is more, like area or regional studies, tourism research, I would argue, has not developed distinctive methodologies and analytical frameworks; in data gathering and analysis researchers in the field of tourism invariably draw on their disciplinary training and methods (King, 2014: 44-64).

Clearly the dominant concepts in the study of tourism have been provided through sociological and anthropological research and through political economy and historical perspectives. These were initiated in the 1970s in the work of such scholars as Nelson Graburn (for example, 1976, 1977/1989, 1983, 1984), Dean MacCannell (1973: 589-603, 1976, 1984), Philip Frick McKean (1977/1989) and Valene Smith (1977/1989; and see Sherlock, 2001) and

carried through into the 1980s; concepts such as 'staged authenticity', 'tourism as sacred journey', 'economic dualism' and 'cultural involution' and the distinction between 'hosts and guests' were formulated. In addition, at that time there was no clearly defined field of tourism studies in that it did not possess a set of explicitly delimited and agreed problems and issues to address. There was indeed a process of institutionalisation and consolidation from the 1980s, but it is doubtful if the field of tourism studies has a stronger and more well-defined coherence at the present time. Indeed, it is argued by some critics that tourism studies should be deconstructed, unpackaged and incorporated into other fields of study.

Subsequently from the 1980s we then entered a more complex conceptual and discursive realm. However, the main concepts continued to be accessed from mainstream sociological, anthropological, political economy and historical work. In examining the effects of tourism development in Southeast Asia researchers were drawing on such concepts as 'authenticity' arising from Erik Cohen's work (1988, 2007; Cohen and Cohen (2012b), Eric Hobsbawm's and Terence Ranger's 'invention of tradition' (1983) and John Urry's 'tourist gaze' (1990, 1992: 172-86; Urry and Larsen, 2012; and see Perkins, 2001). There was also a developing literature exploring the interfaces between tourism, anthropology and the sociology of development (Harrison, 1992), as well as expanding interests in the cultural politics of identity, tourism and ethnicity, and processes of 'touristification', symbolisation and representation (see, for example, Bruner, 1991, 2005; Lanfant, 1995: 1-23, 1995b: 24-43; Nash, 1981: 461-468; 1984: 503-522; 1996: 691-694; Picard, 1990a, 1990b, 1996; Picard and Wood, 1997; Selwyn, 1996; Wood, 1980, 1984; Yamashita, 2003: 1-17; Yamashita, Din and Eades, 1997; and see King, 2008: 104-36, 2009: 43-68).

A constant theme running through much of this endeavour was the need to understand the interactions and relationships – the encounters - between a range of stakeholders engaged in the touristic experience. However, I accept that there has been a move away from some of these earlier concepts: authenticity and staging, the tourist gaze, and hosts and guests (and other binaries: local and foreign, domestic and international), though I would like to retain the notion of categories of people/stakeholders in interaction in a context of mobility at sites of tourist activity.

Mobilities

More recently there has been a conceptually sophisticated attempt to overcome the perceived problem of Eurocentrism, though again the tendency is to establish an insider-outsider binary. This critical intervention again refers to Syed Farid Alatas' call for alternative discourses. Erik Cohen and Scott Cohen have proposed that a 'mobilities' approach to 'discretionary travel' [tourism] might serve to address the Eurocentric character of conceptual frameworks in the field of tourism studies, or more specifically in the sociology of tourism (2012a, 2014a, 2014b, 2015). More than this they argue that a mobilities perspective might serve to set in motion a 'paradigmatic shift' in the study of tourism. Their work has emerged in the context of globalised processes of change and the expansion and differentiation of the experience and contexts of personal mobility. What is more this context also helps explain the proliferation of alternative or emerging tourisms which have been generated to serve an increasingly mobile and discerning constituency in search of different experiences from those that are perceived as commonplace, and as mass and packaged tourism. Moreover, because many more people are now on the move tourism has increasingly come to be conceptualised as part of wider social, cultural, economic and political processes of movement and should, as the Cohens propose, increasingly be considered within the framework of mobilities.

For me the value of the Cohens approach is to address the issue of the problematical nature of tourism as a category and as an apparently unified and defined field of study, and to draw attention to the fact that there is now a range of phenomena and activities which are included (or becoming increasingly so) within tourism, but which were previously considered within other forms of scholarly enquiry or were seen as part of other areas of social, cultural, economic and political life (business, labour mobility, migration, diasporas, retirement). In this regard, they are often referred to as 'new or emergent' tourisms. In addition, the mobilities approach throws up other motivations for travel, not necessarily in seeking authenticity, for example, but in preoccupations with prestige and markers of modernity. There is then no longer a division between the ordinary and extraordinary, between work and leisure, home and away, study and entertainment, and reality and fantasy. Other binaries also collapse: between domestic and international, host and guest, and the authentic and inauthentic (2012a: 2181-2183); and, in the case of Asia, Asian and non-Asian.

Well before the Cohens developed their mobilities paradigm, Franklin and Chang had already presented a strong case for the relocation of the study of tourism within a broader conceptual field; even then they perceived tourism as 'no longer a specialist consumer product or mode of consumption', and no longer an event, process or phenomenon of minor or marginally eccentric importance in post-modern life nor something separable, discrete and exotic, but as 'a significant modality' which was contributing to the organization and transformation of people's everyday lives (2001: 6-7; and see Rojek, 1995; Rojek and Urry, 1997; Inglis, 2000). In other words, 'The majority of people are now part of the market aimed initially at visiting outsiders', indeed 'more or less *everyone* now lives in a world rendered or reconfigured as interesting, entertaining and attractive – for tourists' (Franklin and Chang, 2001: 9).

The Cohens take their inspiration from the pioneer voice in the sociology of mobilities, John Urry (2000, 2007). Urry has been concerned, in association with Kevin Hannam and Mimi Sheller among others, to develop our understanding of these processes of movement (Hannam and Knox, 2010; Hannam, Sheller and Urry, 2006: 1-22; Sheller and Urry, 2004, 2006: 207-226). But, as Sheller indicates, citing Urry, and this is important for my argument, the concept of 'mobilities' does not comprise a coherent conceptual model, but rather captures the coming together of disparate fields of study (2011: 3; and see Urry, 2007). It therefore does not, in my view, constitute a paradigm.

In their earlier excursions into what they have styled the developing paradigm of mobilities, the Cohens also explored two additional interrelated 'novel theoretical approaches'. These comprise: the 'performativity approach' and 'actor-network theory' (ANT) (2012a: 2180-2186). They suggest that the mobilities paradigm and the other theoretical approaches are not fully formed, but they do offer exciting perspectives and ways forward in understanding travel in a continuously globalising environment. They also acknowledge that there are tensions between conceptual and analytical innovations and conventional empirical research (2012a: 2185-2186).

The Performativity Approach

I have already argued elsewhere (King, 2015a: 512-513) that this approach is not as novel as the Cohens suggest (2012a: 2183-2184); it is a loose concept embracing expressions and actions which include well-established and familiar sociological concepts (behaviour and meaningful bodily

movement, identity, symbolic and self-representation and -expression, impression management, staging, imaging, and simulation). But what this approach draws attention to are the ways in which performance is connected to the creation of places and identities (both for residents and those visiting) and to the structuring and changing of relationships and meanings through an increasingly 'reflexive awareness' in tourist sites (Edensor, 2001, 2007; Franklin and Crang, 2001: 10). In other words, performativity does not only refer to the staging of tourist-related events, but also to tourist behaviour and reflections (see Bruner, 2005). It also comprises the translation of symbolic categories and representations into concrete, observable acts which often form part of a repetitive cultural repertoire presented to and in interaction with tourists (who themselves perform, adopt roles, and have agency), but which can be subject to modification and change depending on consumer and market demands and on the reflections and perceptions of those involved in the staging of their cultures in tourist contexts. These concerns with performativity can also be brought into relationship with earlier concerns in tourism studies, exemplified in Tom Selwyn's study of symbolism, images, myths, representations and semiotics (1996). However, performativity is not a coherent theoretical approach, nor is it a paradigm. Much of what is included in this framework can be accommodated within the concept of 'encounter'.

Actor-Network Theory

In regard to the Cohens' notion of 'actor-network-theory' (ANT) (2012a: 2184-2186) it is also difficult to detect anything here that is especially original, although any analysis of tourist experiences has to examine relations between people/actors/mediators/translators and between humans and non-humans (things/objects); in this regard, according to the Cohens, networks are seen as project-specific, in flux, hybrid, and heterogeneous (see also van der Duim, 2007). The emphasis is on impermanence, but surely networks can be sustained by continuous performance and re-energising; in other words, there can be a degree of consolidation so that some network relationships are more solid and on-going than others and regularities and patterns are discernible (Boissevain, 1979: 392-4). Furthermore, the dynamism and transformative capacities in networks are not only located in 'translators' or 'mediators'. It is useful to refer to the emergence of network analysis in anthropology in the 1950s and 1960s in that the perspective of constantly shifting social arenas should be qualified. Again, the concept of 'encounter' can address the problems generated by this element of the Cohens' emerging paradigm.

Encounters

In my experience, a persistent theme in research on tourism in Southeast Asia during the past two decades has been the importance of understanding encounters and interactions, drawing in part on symbolic interactionist perspectives (see, for example, Argyle, 2009: 9-14; Berg, 2001: 8-10; Blumer, 1969: 5), and situated within an understanding of wider economic and political processes and structures of change and in relation to issues of culture and identity (King, 2016c, 2016d). The concern with encounters was captured in Valene Smith's dual categorization of 'hosts and guests' and their interrelationships and exchanges (1977/1989); it has remained central to my recent collaborative work on heritage sites, though this simple categorical opposition between local residents and visitors from outside needs considerable modification to address the complexities of touristic encounters and the domestic and intra-Asian dimension; but it need not be abandoned (King, 2016b; Sherlock, 2001).

I have argued elsewhere that our understanding of encounters, including both chance and planned or arranged engagements and those which are one-off or multiple, regular or irregular, and reciprocal, collaborative, complementary or adversarial is still the central focus of the tourist experience. These encounters comprise person-to-person relationships, those between groups (or at least between members or representatives of groups), and those between local communities and national and international bodies and agencies. They also embrace interactions of individuals and groups within electronic and media networks and with information technology (which includes images and representations), between individuals and information provided in material form (guidebooks, tourist and government agency literature, travel books, signage and displays at sites), and between individuals and material objects (in museums, exhibition centres, at archaeological and heritage sites, in natural landscapes [which includes fauna and flora]). Encounters between people are often cross-ethnic, cross-cultural and cross-national; but with the rapid increase in travel, leisure and tourism within national boundaries, and between related culture areas, the cross-cultural dimension needs qualification. This in turn poses questions about the distinction and sometimes opposition between 'domestic and international' tourists, though this categorisation remains a useful way to capture broad differentiations. Encounters also encompass the behaviours generated (in bodily expressions, language, dress), the motivations and interpretations implicated

in them, and their character (for example whether they are one-off and temporary, or continuous, reciprocal or conflictual).

With specific reference to the developing research on heritage tourism in Southeast Asia, there is evidence again of the deployment of the concept of 'encounters'. A recently completed comparative volume on UNESCO World Heritage Sites in Southeast Asia across seven countries and twenty cultural and natural sites in the region demonstrates this analytical framework (King, 2016b). In examining encounters there is recognition that these global sites, which are located and demarcated in national territories, mark out spaces for complex interactions between various interest groups (local communities, tourists, conservationists and researchers, national and provincial politicians and bureaucrats, and international heritage and tourism organisations). Importantly the character and consequences of these interactions, as well as the pressures exerted on the sites from visitors and from other developmental forces, present the management bodies responsible for them with problems in coordinating and attempting to resolve some of the competing interests and tensions between conservation and protection, tourism development and local community involvement, and local identities and priorities as against government priorities in deploying and presenting heritage for national and international political, economic and cultural purposes. What has also emerged is the importance of these sites, not only as global sites visited by international tourists, but also as domestic sites frequented by their own citizens, often with different motives for visiting from those who come from outside the nation-state. This has become an increasingly important theme in recent tourism research and one which modifies considerably perspectives on world heritage. However, I would stress that the concept of 'encounter' is a low level conceptual framework directed to the analysis of empirical material and is not part of a grand theoretical scheme or paradigm. I would also hesitate to give it the status of a mid-range concept (Mielke and Hornidge, 2017-19-20).

Conclusions

The purpose of this extended excursion into a discussion of concepts is to address the issue of emerging tourisms and how we handle them. With reference to the mobilities approach and its inclusion of tourism in a broad range of movements (some of which might be difficult to separate one from another), it is evident that some emerging activities categorised as touristic are simply brought under the umbrella of tourism because they involve movement. We therefore must be

much more discriminating in the way in which we address emerging tourisms, and not to confuse tourism with travel and movement. The proliferation of new tourisms also has to be treated critically in that it is clearly part of marketing strategies and internet promotions.

In examining the insider-outsider, East-West, indigenised-Euro-American perspective, I have suggested that these binaries are not analytically helpful. Nor do I think that we need alternative discourses, paradigms and theories to handle emerging tourisms, let alone established ones. We can analyse and understand them with the current analytical-conceptual tools which we have at our disposal, with obvious modifications; and at least part of our understanding can be derived from examining touristic encounters.

Returning to the mobilities approach proposed by the Cohens, I am doubtful whether it is helpful in understanding and analysing on-the-ground activities and interactions whether established or emerging. Of course, it situates and contextualises encounters, negotiations, collaborations, tensions, and conflicts within an environment of movement and within wider processes of change and transformation, but it does not provide some of the basic tools to examine what is happening in the everyday worlds of social and cultural engagement (power struggle, empowerment, conflict and tension, unequal exchange, reciprocity, inter-cultural engagement, emulation and so on). The gap between this higher-level conceptualisation, which still does not have the status of a paradigm (nor does the performativity approach and actor-network theory), and the need to handle grounded empirical material is still wide.

Finally, it has been informative to examine the status of multi-disciplinary studies in relation to research in Asia/Southeast Asia and to draw attention to the fact that they have been subject to the same kinds of criticisms as the field of tourism studies; the main focus of attention has been on Western hegemony and Eurocentrism, or Anglo-American-centrism; we need also to turn a critical lens to the construction and concept of Occidentalism and whether it does present us with opportunities for the development of ‘alternative discourses’. I have already given my verdict. In my view, this is all now in the past; we look to the future, and we dispense with the dichotomy of insider-outsider whether it has been deployed in tourism studies and research in Asia/Southeast Asia or in Asian/Southeast Asian Studies.

References

Alatas, S. F. (1993). 'On the Indigenization of Academic Discourse', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political,* 18(3): 307-338.

Alatas, S.F. (2000). 'Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits and Problems', *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science,* 28(1): 23-45.

Alatas, S. F. (2001). 'Alternative Discourses in Southeast Asia', *Sari*: *Jurnal Alam dan Tamadun Melayu*, 19: 49-67.

Alatas, S. F. (2003). 'Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences', *Current Sociology,* 51(6): 599-613.

Alatas, S. F. (2004). 'The Meaning of Alternative Discourses: Illustrations from Southeast Asia', in S. Ravi, M. Rutten and B.L. Goh (eds.), *Asia in Europe, Europe in Asia*, The Netherlands: IIAS and Singapore: ISEAS Publications, pp. 57-78.

Alatas, S. F. (2005). 'Afterword. Indigenization: Features and Problems', in J. van Bremen, E. Ben-Ari and S.F. Alatas (eds.), *Asian Anthropology*, London: Routledge, pp. 227-243.

Alatas, S. F. (2006a). *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Sciences: Responses to Eurocentrism*, New Delhi: SAGE.

Alatas, S.F. (2006b). 'The Autonomous, the Universal and the Future of Sociology', *Current Anthropology,* 54(1): 7-23.

Alatas, S.F. (2009). 'Religion and Reform: Two Exemplars for Autonomous Sociology in the Non-Western Context', in S. Patel (ed.), *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions,* London: SAGE, pp. 29-39.

Alatas, S.F. (2015). 'Doing Sociology in Southeast Asia', *Cultural Dynamics,* 27: 191-202.

Alatas, S.F. and Sinha V. (2001). 'Teaching Classical Sociological Theory in Singapore: The Context of Eurocentrism', *Teaching Sociology,* 29(3): 316-333.

Alatas, S. H. (1956). 'Some Fundamental Problems of Colonialism', London, *Eastern World*, November: 9-10.

Alatas, S. H. (1972). 'The Captive Mind in Development Studies', *International Social Science Journal*, 24(1): 9-25.

Alatas, S. H. (1974). 'The Captive Mind and Creative Development', *International Social Science Journal*, 26(4): 691-700.

Alatas, S. H. (1977). *The Myth of the Lazy Native: a Study of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th Century and its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*, London: Frank Cass.

Alatas, S. H. (1979). 'Toward an Asian Social Science Tradition', *New Quest*, 17: 265-269.

Alatas, S. H. (2000). 'Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits and Problems', *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 28(1): 23-45.

Alneng, V. (2002). 'The Modern Does Not Care for Natives: Travel Ethnography and the Conventions of Form', *Tourist Studies*, 2(2): 119-142.

Argyle. M. (2009). 'Introduction', in M. Argyle (ed), *Social Encounters: Contributions to Social Interaction*, Rutgers, The State University, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, pp. 9-14.

Ben-Ari, E. and van Bremen, J. (2005). 'Asian Anthropologies and Anthropologists in Asia: An Introductory Essay', in J. van Bremen, E. Ben-Ari and S.F. Alatas (eds.), *Asian Anthropology*, London: Routledge, pp. 3-39.

Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 4th ed.

Boissevain, J. (1979). 'Network Analysis: a Reappraisal', *Current Anthropology* 20(2): 392-394.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*, Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Bruner, E. M. (1991). 'Transformation of Self in Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2): 238-250.

Bruner, E. M. (2005). *Culture on Tour: Ethnographies of Travel*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Burns, P. M. (1999). *An Introduction to Tourism and Anthropology*, London and New York: Routledge.

Chang, T.C. (2015). 'The Asian Wave and Critical Tourism Scholarship', *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 11, supplement 1: 83-101.

Cohen, E. (1972). 'Towards a Sociology of International Tourism', *Social Research*, 39(1): 164-182.

Cohen, E. (1979a). 'Rethinking the Sociology of Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1): 18-35.

Cohen, E. (1979b). 'A Phenomenology of Tourist Experiences', *Sociology*, 13(2): 179-201.

Cohen, E. (1984). 'The Sociology of Tourism: Approaches, Issues and Findings', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10: 373-392.

Cohen, E. (1988). 'Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(3): 371-386.

Cohen, E. (2007). 'Authenticity in Tourism Studies: *Aprés la lute*', *Tourism Recreation Research*, 32(1): 75-82.

Cohen, E., and Cohen, S. A. (2012a). 'Current Sociological Theories and Issues in Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39, (4): 2177-2202.

Cohen, E., and Cohen, S. A. (2012b). 'Authentication: Hot and Cool', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(3): 1295-3014.

Cohen, E., and Cohen, S. A. (2014a). 'A Mobilities Approach to Tourism from Emerging World Regions', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(1): 11-43.

Cohen, E., and Cohen, S. A. (2014b). 'Tourism Mobilities from Emerging World Regions: A Response to Commentaries', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(1): 68-69.

Cohen, E., and Cohen, S. A. (2015). 'Beyond Eurocentrism in Tourism: A Paradigm Shift to Mobilities', *Tourism Recreation Research*, 40(2): 157-168.

Curiousmatic (2016). '4 emerging types of tourism reflect a changing world', https://curiousmatic.com/4-emerging-types-tourism-reflect-changing-world (Accessed 23 August 2016).

Edensor, T. (2001). 'Performing Tourism, Staging Tourism', *Tourist Studies*, 1(1): 59-81.

Edensor, T. (2007). 'Mundane Mobilities: Performances and Spaces of Tourism', *Social and Cultural Geography,* 8(2): 199-215.

Evans, G. (2005). 'Indigenous and Indigenized Anthropology in Asia', in J. van Bremen, E. Ben-Ari and S.F. Alatas (eds.), *Asian Anthropology*. London: Routledge, pp. 43-55.

Franklin, A., and Crang, M. (2001). 'Editorial: The Trouble with Tourism and Travel Theory', *Tourist Studies,* 1(1): 5-22.

Goh, B.L. (2011a). 'Disciplines and Area Studies in the Global Age: Southeast Asian Reflections', in B.L. Goh (ed.), *Decentring and Diversifying Southeast Asian Studies: Perspectives from the Region,* Singapore: ISEAS Publishing, pp. 1-59.

Goh, B. L. ed. (2011b). *Decentring and Diversifying Southeast Asian Studies: Perspectives from the Region*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Graburn, N. H. H. (ed.) (1976). *Ethnic and Tourist Arts: Cultural Expressions from the Fourth World*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Graburn, N. H. H. (1977/1989). 'Tourism: The Sacred Journey', in V. L. Smith (ed.), *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism,* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 17-32; 2nd. rev. ed. 1989, pp. 21-36.

Graburn, N. H. H. (1983). 'The Anthropology of Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10(1): 9-33.

Graburn, N. H. H. (1984). 'The Evolution of Tourist Arts', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(3): 393-420.

Hannam K., Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2006). 'Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities, Moorings', *Mobilities,* 1(1): 1-22.

Hannam, K. and Knox, D. (2010). *Understanding Tourism: A Critical Introduction*, London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Harrison, D. (ed.) (1992). *Tourism & the Less Developed Countries,* London: Belhaven Press.

Heryanto, A. (2002). 'Can There be Southeast Asians in Southeast Asian Studies?', *Moussons. Recherche en sciences humaines sur l'Asie du Sud-Est,* 5 (1): 3-30.

Heryanto, A. (2007). 'Can There be Southeast Asians in Southeast Asian Studies?', in L. J. Sears (ed.), *Knowing Southeast Asian Subjects*, Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press and Singapore: NUS Press, pp. 75-108.

Hitchcock, M., King, V.T, and Parnwell, M. J. G. (eds.) (1993). *Tourism in South-East Asia*, London: Routledge.

Hitchcock, M., King, V. T., and Parnwell, M. (eds.) (2009). *Tourism in Southeast Asia: Challenges and New Directions*, Copenhagen: NIAS Press and Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hitchcock, M., King, V. T., and Parnwell, M. (eds.) (2010). *Heritage Tourism in Southeast Asia*, Copenhagen: NIAS Press and Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hobsbawm, E. and Ranger, T. (eds.) (1983). *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inglis, F. (2000). *The Delicious History of the Holiday*, London: Routledge.

King, V. T. (2006). 'Southeast Asia: Personal Reflections on a Region', in C. Chou and V. Houben (eds.), *Southeast Asian Studies: Debates and New Directions*, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, and Leiden: International Institute of Asian Studies, pp. 23-44.

King, V. T. (2008). 'Tourism in Asia: A Review of the Achievements and Challenges', *Sojourn. Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 23(1): 104-136.

King, V. T. (2009). 'Anthropology and Tourism in Southeast Asia: Comparative Studies, Cultural Differentiation and Agency', in M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. Parnwell (eds.), *Tourism in Southeast Asia: Challenges and New Directions*, Copenhagen: NIAS Press and Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 43-68.

King, V.T. (2014). 'Southeast Asian Studies: The Conundrum of Area and Method', in M. Huotari, J. Rüland and J. Schlehe (eds.), *Methodology and Practice in Southeast Asian Studies*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 44-63.

King, V.T. (2015a). 'Encounters and Mobilities: Conceptual Issues in Tourism Studies in Southeast Asia', *Sojourn. Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 30(2): 497-527.

King, V. T. (2015b). 'Substantive and Conceptual Issues in Tourism Research: A Personal Engagement with Southeast Asia', *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 11, supplement 1: 15-51.

King, V.T. (2016a). 'Southeast Asian Studies: Insiders and Outsiders, or is Culture and Identity the Way Forward?', *Suvannabhumi: Multi-disciplinary Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 8(2): 17-53.

King, V. T. (ed.) (2016b). *UNESCO in Southeast Asia: World Heritage Sites in Comparative Perspective*, Copenhagen: NIAS Press.

King, V. T. (2016c). 'Conceptualising Culture, Identity and Region: Recent Reflections on Southeast Asia', *Pertanika. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 24(1): 25-42.

King, V. T. (2016d). 'Ethnicity and Tourism in Southeast Asia: Culture on the Move', *Asian Journal of Tourism Research*, 1(1): 29-58.

Lanfant, M-F. (1995a). 'Introduction', in M-F Lanfant, J. B. Allcock, and E. M. Bruner (eds.), *International Tourism: Identity and Chang*e, London: Sage Publications, Sage Studies in International Sociology, 47, pp. 1-23.

Lanfant, M-F. (1995b). 'International Tourism, Internationalization and the Challenge to Identity', in M-F Lanfant, J. B. Allcock, and E. M. Bruner (eds.), *International Tourism: Identity and Chang*e, London: Sage Publications, Sage Studies in International Sociology, 47, pp. 24-43.

List 25 (2016). '25 types of tourism you might want to try', https://list 25.com/25-bizarre-types-of-tourism-you-might-want-to-try (Accessed 23 August 2016).

MacCannell, D. (1973). 'Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings', *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3): 589-603.

MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, Berkeley: University of California Press

MacCannell, D. (1984). 'Reconstructed Ethnicity: Tourism and Cultural Identity in Third World Communities', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(3): 375-391.

McKean, P. F. (1977/1989). 'Towards a Theoretical Analysis of Tourism: Economic Dualism and Cultural Involution in Bali', in V. L. Smith (ed.), *Host and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 93-107; 2nd rev. ed. 1989, pp. 119-138.

Mielke, K. and Hornidge, A-K. (2017). 'Introduction: Knowledge Production, Area Studies and the Mobility Turn' in K. Mielke and A-K. Hornidge (eds.), *Area Studies at the Crossroads: Knowledge Production after the Mobility Turn*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 3-26.

Nash, D. (1981). 'Tourism as an Anthropological Subject', *Current Anthropology*, 22(5): 461-468.

Nash, D. (1984). 'The Ritualization of Tourism: Comment on Graburn's *The Anthropology of Tourism*', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(3): 503-522.

Nash, D. (1996). 'On Anthropologists and Tourists', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3): 691-694.

Nyiri, P. (2006). *Scenic Spots: Chinese Tourism, the State and Cultural Authority,* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Nyiri, P. (2009). 'Between Encouragement and Control: Tourism, Modernity and Discipline in China' in T. Winter, P. Teo, and T.C. Chang (eds.), *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism,* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 153-169.

Perkins, Harvey C. (2001). 'Gazing or Performing? Reflections on Urry's Tourist Gaze in the Context of Contemporary Experience in the Antipodes', *International Sociology,* 16(2): 185-204.

Picard, M. (1990a). '"Cultural Tourism" in Bali: Cultural Performances as Tourist Attraction', *Indonesia*, 49, April: 37-74.

Picard, M. (1990b). '*Kebalian Orang Bali*: Tourism and the Uses of "Balinese Culture" in New Order Indonesia', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs*, 24(2):1-38.

Picard, M. (1996). *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture*, Singapore: Archipelago Press.

Picard, M. and Wood, R. E. (eds.) (1997). *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Porananond, P. and King, V.T. (eds.) (2014). *Rethinking Asian Tourism: Culture, Encounters and Local Response*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Porananond, P. and King, V.T. (eds.) (2016). *Tourism and Monarchy in Southeast Asia,* Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Rojek, C. (1995). *Decentring Leisure: Rethinking Leisure Theory*, London: Sage.

Rojek, C. and Urry, J. (eds.) (1997). *Touring Cultures*, London: Routledge.

Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*: *Western Conceptions of the Orient,* New York: Pantheon Books and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Said, E.W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Alfred Knopf.

Selwyn, T. (ed.) (1996). *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth-making in Tourism*, Chichester: Wiley.

Sheller, M. (2011). 'Mobility', *Sociopedia.isa*, 2011, DOI: 10.1177/205684601163.

Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (eds.) (2004). *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play*, London and New York: Routledge.

Sheller, M. and Urry, J. (2006). 'The New Mobilities Paradigm', *Environment and Planning A*, 38(2): 207-226.

Sherlock, K. (2001). 'Revisiting the Concept of Hosts and Guests', *Tourist Studies*, 1(3): 271-295.

Singh, S. (ed.) (2009/2011). *Domestic Tourism in Asia: Diversity and Divergence*, London: Earthscan, 2009; Singapore: ISEAS, 2011.

Smith, V. L. (ed.) (1977/1989). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; 2nd rev. ed. 1989.

Teo, P., and Chang, T.C. (eds.) (1998). *Tourism in Southeast Asia*, special issue *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 19(2):119-237.

Teo, P., Chang, T.C. and Ho, K.C. (eds.) (2001). *Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*, Oxford: Elsevier Science, Pergamon.

Teo, P. and Yeoh, B.S.A. (2001). 'Negotiating Global Tourism: Localism and Difference in Southeast Asian Theme Parks', P. Teo, T.C. Chang and K. C. Ho (eds.), *Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*, Oxford: Elsevier Science, Pergamon, pp. 137-154.

Teo, P. and Leong, S. (2006). 'A Postcolonial Analysis of Backpacking', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1): 109-131.

Thompson, E.C. (2008). 'A World of Anthropologies: Paradigms and Challenges for the Coming Century', *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 36(1): 121-127.

Thompson, E.C. (2012). 'Anthropology in Southeast Asia: National Traditions and Transnational Practices', *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 40: 664-689.

Toptenz (2016). 'Top ten weird types of tourism', https://www.toptenz.net/top-10-weird-types of tourism.php (Accessed 23 August 2016).

Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, London: Sage, 1990.

Urry, J. (1992). 'The Tourist Gaze "Revisited"', *The American Behavioural Scientist*, 36 (2): 172-186.

Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-First Century*, London: Routledge.

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Urry, J. and Jonas Larsen, J. (2012). *The Tourist Gaze 3.0*, London: Sage Publications Ltd., 3rd. ed.

Van Bremen, J., Ben-Ari, E. and Alatas, S.F. (eds.) (2005). *Asian Anthropology*, London: Routledge.

Van der Duim, René. (2007). 'Tourismscapes: An Actor-network Perspective', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(4): 961-976.

Vickers, A. (2009). *Southeast Asian Studies after Said.* openjournals.library.usyd.edu.au/index.php/ART/article/viewFile/5707/6378; inaugural lecture, 3 September 2009, pp. 58-72.

Winter, T. (2007). 'Rethinking Tourism in Asia', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1): 27-44.

Winter, T. (2009a). 'Conclusion: Recasting Tourism Theory towards an Asian Future', T. Winter, P. Teo and T.C. Chang (eds.), *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 315-325.

Winter, T. (2009b). 'Asian Tourism and the Retreat of Anglo-Western Centrism in Tourism Theory', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(1): 21-31.

Winter, T., Teo, P. and Chang, T.C. (eds.) (2009a). *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism*, London and New York: Routledge.

Winter, T., Teo, P. and Chang, T.C. (2009b). 'Introduction. Rethinking Tourism in Asia', T. Winter, P. Teo and T.C. Chang (eds.), *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-18.

Wood, R. E. (1980). 'International Tourism and Cultural Change in Southeast Asia', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 28(3): 561-581.

Wood, R. E. (1984). 'Ethnic Tourism, the State, and Cultural Change in South-East Asia', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(3): 353-374.

Yamashita S. (2003). *Bali and Beyond: Explorations in the Anthropology of Tourism*, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Yamashita, S. (2004). 'Asian Anthropologies: Foreign, Native, and Indigenous', S. Yamashita, J. Bosco and S.F. Alatas (eds.), *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*, New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 1-34.

Yamashita S., Din, H. K. and Eades, J. S. (eds.) (1997). *Tourism and Cultural Development in Asia and Oceania*, Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.