

Diverse Economies and Alternative Economic Practices in Tourism

Jan Mosedale

University of Sunderland

A draft chapter for N. Morgan, I. Ateljevic and A. Pritchard (Eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Creating an Academy of Hope*. London and New York: Routledge.

Abstract:

This chapter discusses what is generally considered to be ‘the economy’ and deconstructs its representations as a singular pervasive abstract entity to unlock diverse economies. A focus on economic practices in tourism offers a new epistemological strategy to analyse the confluence of structure and agency in respect to economic actions. The chapter examines alternative economic examples in tourism (such as home exchange, gift-giving, charity, voluntourism, wwoofing) to offer examples of economic practices following market, alternative market and non-market exchanges.

Introduction

Research on tourism economies still lags behind contemporary research in the wider economic social sciences (mainly in anthropology, geography and sociology). It is dominated by quantitative, universalistic survey methods framed by studies of consumer behaviour and to-date largely ignores the cultural meanings of exchange relationships. The bulk of research on tourism economies either fails to mention alternative economies or simply views them as minor distortions of a capitalist system. The inherent difficulty of quantifying and measuring alternative exchanges and thus incorporating or addressing alternative economic practices in national accounts or official accounting systems offers governments and researchers a pretext to disregard, ignore or trivialize these economies.

In this chapter, I claim that critical tourism scholars should engage with and think critically about the representations of 'the economy'. I aim to challenge a capitalocentric understanding of tourism and argue for an economy that is constituted of complex and dynamic relationships between a variety of economic practices at multiple sites and spaces. In making this argument, I primarily draw on literature on diverse economies (Gibson-Graham 1996, 2006, Leyshon *et al.* 2003) and alternative economic practices in varied cultural and socio-economic contexts (Smith and Stenning 2006, Pavlovskaya 2004, Amin *et al.* 2002) and use examples of economic practices from the tourism literature.

First the chapter will discuss and deconstruct the representations of ‘the economy’ to unlock diverse economies ; second, practices are briefly contextualised as a new epistemological strategy to analyse the meeting point of structure and agency in respect to economic actions; finally, the diverse economies of tourism are separated into economic practices according to market, alternative market and non-market exchanges following the diverse economies framework by Gibson-Graham (2006).

(Re)thinking economies

The dominant discourse in most societies elevates the economic to an entity that ultimately controls society. This meta-narrative is widely presumed to be following an inescapable economic logic (Williams 2005): Economic transactions are performed according to ‘free’ market exchange (unrestrained by social or political impediments). Prices are determined by the laws of supply and demand and labour is sold to producers in order to transform raw materials into products to be sold for a surplus. The labourers’ wage allows for the purchase of the necessities of life and additional luxuries.

In this narrative, there is no room for differences or alternatives. Yet although this myth of a single and pervasive capitalist market economy is uttered by many academics, politicians and capitalists (see Williams 2005), there are multifarious social exchanges that *do not* follow the ‘rules’ of a capitalist market economy (Williams and Nadin 2010, Gibson-Graham 1996, 2006, Leyshon *et al.* 2003, Williams 2005). Yet, ‘the economy’ has been elevated to a mythical status beyond the control of society, leading Gibson-Graham (2006: 53) to question its common usage: ‘Why has Economy become an

everyday term that denotes a force to be reckoned with existing outside of politics and society – a force that constitutes the ultimate arbiter of possibility?’ The capitalist market economy is generally considered to be ‘the economy’, but is merely one aspect of a bundle of different social practices that together constitute a set of diverse economies.

This representation of ‘the economy’ as a singular and all-encompassing abstract entity reduces the economy to mere monetary values and stifles possible alternatives and parallel economies (Gibson-Graham 2006). Yet, the term is itself socially constructed and therefore open to a de-construction in order to reach a pluralist understanding of economies (Massey 1997, Mosedale 2011). The problem is not that there is a dominant, capitalist discourse but that this representation of the economy has become extradiscursive (beyond discourse) and thus hegemonic, that it does not permit any alternatives. We have come to accept the singular and pervasive nature of ‘the economy’ and do not question its meaning (the meaning has been fixed in our collective imagination). This leads to the ‘economistic fallacy’ (Polanyi 2002) where ‘the practice of analyzing all economic systems through the theoretical gaze that presumes that the horizons of the economy are fully comprehended by a map that includes only market exchange and the calculative behavior couplet’ (Adaman and Madra 2002: 1046). The dominant discourse should not diminish the diverse nature of our economic practices. In order to understand the diverse economies in tourism, we need to go beyond a capitalocentric understanding of the tourism economy and use a map or ontology that makes it possible to include different economies. Then the economic subject is shaped, formed and constituted by social structures, as well as agency and the local context.

Critical scholars should 'unfix' or deconstruct the meanings of 'the economy' in order to reconstruct diverse economies that are inclusive of economic difference (economies that differ from the dominant capitalist economy). Once we start to (re)think the artificial and socially constructed boundaries of 'the economy' and view it in a more pluralistic manner, 'new economic imaginaries' (Gibson-Graham, 2002: 2) can emerge and become discursively viable: 'Then a whole new world moves into view' (Thrift and Olds, 1996: 311).

The Cultural Turn and its effect on the economic social sciences was the first major turning point for a deconstruction of 'the economy'. In their seminal volume Lee and Wills (1997), for instance, offer an analysis of different approaches towards the economic subject and promote the widening of economic research to include culture as a key constituent. The Cultural Turn led to a significant shift from seeing 'the economy' as transactions which are somehow separate from social and cultural spheres to understanding the economic subject as a fluid economic landscape consisting of multiple economies embedded in place-specific cultural, as well as historic, contexts and social relations (see Mosedale 2011 for a more detailed discussion of the relationship of culture and economies following the Cultural Turn and how it relates to tourism research).

Poststructural political economists take a slightly different approach to diverse economies in that they do not merely see the analysis of the multiple natures of economic practices that constitute diverse and pluralist economies as a new research agenda, but also as a political project to prepare the ground for a multifaceted, flexible

and open-ended economy of non-capitalist practices that is able to overcome the grand narrative of capitalism: the myth of a singular, pervasive economy (Gibson-Graham 1996, 2006). Recognising that discourses about the economy are contested may lead to wider representations of frictions within the capitalist economy and offer opportunities to embed the term within every-day practices influenced by specific geographical and historical contexts. For a critical analysis of economies it is necessary to reconnect economies with wider society, as they are constantly reproduced via social practices (Mosedale 2011).

1. Practices

The economy is not an abstract notion but something that people *do* in everyday life as people create livelihoods. By analysing practices and concentrating not just on the social structures but also on human agency it becomes possible to view individuals not as mere subjects of the economy, or ‘anticapitalist subject, with its negative and stymied positioning’ (Gibson-Graham 2006: xxxv), but as actors that are engaged in, shaping and (re)producing economies. Focusing on practices offers an opportunity to transcend debates on structure and agency (Mosedale 2011). Both structure and agency meet and become visible in practices (Giddens 1979), which can be employed as tactics or strategies to resist structures and yet may also result from these structures. Hence, de Certeau (1984) views everyday practices as individual tactical decisions either to conform to a social order or to resist or subvert the dominant structure via the expression of individuality. In this context, economic practices provide ‘... ways of knowing the world through action, but also form – through action – the materiality of the world through the creation, reproduction and unfolding of material social relations’

(Smith and Stenning 2006: 192-193). Practices can be helpful in analysing how overarching phenomena such as class, gender, networks etc. are enacted, (re)produced and potentially transformed in everyday practices by individuals who themselves embody these phenomena. The analysis of practices and actions then become an epistemological strategy as everyday practices become the object of analysis for the interpretation of socioeconomic processes (Jones and Murphy forthcoming). This new focus on seemingly mundane or ordinary practices can inform our understanding of economies as constituted of multitudes of practices, social structures, materials and meanings.

Alternative economic practices in tourism

Economic practices as individual strategies influenced by structure and agency form the focus for the following discussion of diverse economies in tourism. Gibson-Graham (2006) demonstrates the diversity of economic practices by highlighting the difference in transactions (the mode of exchange), labour and the configuration of production, ownership and distribution of surpluses (organizational form). Table 1 presents an overview of diverse economies with examples of different economic practices occurring in tourism.

[INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE]

This section will follow Gibson-Graham's (2006) categorization of economic practices in order to explore the varied forms that economic practices may take in tourism and

how they are embedded in specific social, cultural and political contexts. The confines of this chapter do not permit a discussion of the full range of economic practices in tourism, but the aim is to provide selected examples in order to convey the diverse nature of social economic relations.

Organizational Form

One aspect of economic diversity is the general configuration of production, ownership and the distribution of surpluses (i.e. different ways and structures of accumulating and distributing wealth). The economic organization in capitalism is centered around privately owned capital and social relations of material transformation are negotiated by means of wage-based labour. The price of goods and services is determined via the rules of supply and demand and the resulting surplus is distributed to the owners of capital. However, there are other forms of economic organization that differ in the distribution of surplus as profit maximization is not always the only underlying reason for engaging in exchange transactions. Alternative forms of capitalism are influenced by ethical values e.g., social justice, equality and sustainability. While the accumulation of capital still plays a role in alternative capitalism, some surplus is also distributed to non-producers. Firms increasingly recognize that their responsibilities extend beyond the search for profits and that their operations should benefit the wider economy, society and the environment. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a clear example of alternative capitalism, as part of the surplus is distributed to wider stakeholders rather than to the owners and investors. Henderson (2007) analysed the CSR of hotels in Phuket, Thailand after the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. She highlights the complex

interplay between philanthropy and capitalist interest especially with the notion of the triple bottom line, which combines social, environmental and economic returns.

Non-capitalist forms of organization include communal ownership of resources, in which labour surplus is appropriated by the wider community even though it might not have been involved in production. While truly communal ownership is rare in tourism, Ying and Zhou (2007) offer insights into communal tourism development in Xidi, Anhui Province, China. The village committee (elected by local villagers) set up a corporation to develop and manage tourism and to distribute the economic gains. While the households that welcome tourists into their homes receive a wage, a portion of the profit is distributed to the rest of the village regardless of their involvement in tourism and some profit is spent on community welfare projects. Forms of organizations like the 'Xidi Tourism Service' are organized around an ethic of solidarity, as some of the labour surplus is distributed to individuals that are not engaged in the production process.

The organization of production, ownership and the distribution of labour surplus is just one factor that can be used to categorize economic practices, yet often the form of organization is most influenced by social structures. The next section will discuss the specific exchange relations within capitalist, alternative capitalist and non-capitalist forms of organization.

Transactions

Goods and services are circulated via exchange relationships, and these transactions are varied in nature and not necessarily confined to capitalist market exchange following the relationship between supply and demand. In alternative markets, for instance, the equivalence of the exchange is socially negotiated rather than purely subject to supply and demand.

Home exchange is one such economic practice in which the exchange is negotiated between the two parties although elements of demand and supply do still play a role in the exchange. Home exchange can be organized individually but is often mediated by companies who charge a fee to include ads in an online database. The databases offer a marketplace to view and evaluate house exchanges and for interested partners to exchange details. More often than not this is a direct exchange between two parties but may involve more parties e.g. in a three-way exchange where A stays in B's house, B stays in C's house and C stays in A's house.

Demand and supply clearly is a factor in home exchange as home owners who live in locations that are undesirable for others find it more of a challenge to find possible exchange partners: 'An appealing self-made marketing of the overall destination, (including overcoming seasonality issues), the location, the neighborhood and the house itself is often crucial [in] "wooing" the partners' (Arente and Kiiski 2006: 86). The houses do not necessarily need to be of equal value (in terms of housing market or in terms of standard), as location (country, proximity to tourist destinations or urban centres) plays an important role in the exchange as evident in the following quote from an interviewee:

‘But if we want to exchange with a family from the south of France ... maybe we would accept a two bedroom’s [*sic*] apartment. We can’t expect a big villa with the swimming pool. And it will be all right, because the south of France is more appealing to us’.

(cited in Arente and Kiiski 2006: 58)

As the exchange is not regulated, trust is paramount and is often created via communications prior to the exchange (Arente and Kiiski 2006, De Croote and Nicasi 1994). Queries such as insurance cover for the house, usage of the car, telephone charges, etc. need to be addressed in advance to steer clear of potential disputes but also to build up a level of trust between exchange partners before the exchange. Our homes can be quite personal and ‘... one has to get used to the fact that other people sleep in one's bed, cook in one's kitchen, live in one's house’ (de Croote and Nicasi 1994: 23).

The home exchange experience can become more than just an exchange of houses. Arente and Kiiski (2006) talk about ‘emotionally bonded communities’ between the exchange partners but also with the communities that are ‘exchanged’: ‘We were a part of the local society, community where we lived, and that you really can’t buy. You can’t buy that!’ (Interviewees cited in Arente and Kiiski 2006: 64). These bonds may last beyond the duration of the initial transaction.

The equivalence of transactions is usually negotiated directly between the parties (as in

the example of house exchange), but there are numerous examples of alternative transactions where the price of exchange is left to the discretion of the tourist or visitor. Some museums and national parks, for instance, either ask for any amount of voluntary contributions, suggest a range for voluntary contributions, or insist on a contribution but leave the amount to the visitor. In the current context of decreased government funding for cultural and natural public goods and services, publically funded institutions increasingly have to generate additional income (White and Lovett 1999). Many have turned to alternative market exchange in order to be able to continue to provide an easily accessible – essentially still *public* – good or service.

At the same time, the traditional roles of cultural institutions in particular (conservation and education) have changed with more emphasis being placed on their role in regional and urban economic development. Thus Tufts and Milne (1999) offer interesting insights into the relationship between cultural institutions and urban economies by not reducing museums to purely economic actors. Yet the tourism literature has focused primarily on assigning monetary values to public goods and services by concentrating on the willingness-to-pay of tourists and visitors (Reynisdottir *et al.* 2008, Chung *et al.* forthcoming), rather than analysing the social relationships and factors involved in the transaction.

These examples are a mixture of alternative market transactions (via the voluntary contribution) and non-market transactions in the case of visitors that choose not to contribute anything. In most museums and national parks that use voluntary contributions by visitors, these complement public funding (mostly because of

reductions in or generally inadequate public funding). So if the voluntary contribution does not cover the cost, the non-market exchange makes up the difference. In addition, visitors may choose not to pay or their contributions may not reflect the true value/cost of the museum. Similarly most publically funded cultural institutions offer reduced and sometimes staggered pricing for seniors, retirees, students, unemployed people etc. In this case, socio-economic factors are taken into account in addition to supply and demand when determining the cost of transaction.

In contrast to alternative market exchange, non-market transactions do not require a balanced exchange. There are numerous examples of non-market transactions in tourism including some deviant transactions like theft (Botterill and Jones 2010) or embezzlement. Another example of non-market exchange is state involvement in tourism by funding education and training, tourism development to ensure economic regeneration of cities or regions, or tourism promotion etc. This state funding operates outside of market environments with no relation to supply and demand dynamics or balanced exchange, as capital may be redistributed to areas of need either by funding tourism development directly or indirectly (via the provision of associated infrastructure or subsidies) (Hall 2008).

Gift-giving is another example of non-market transactions. Gifts are a symbol of social relationships between the donor and the recipient. Gift-giving is therefore dependent on the cultural context of role status and role expectations. The gift is decoded by the recipient in terms of the finances, time and effort that the donor has invested in the gift (Clarke 2008). Gift giving is not inherently – in reality seldom – altruistic as there may

be expectations of non-material returns such as friendship etc. and egotistic motivations behind the giving of gifts such as an increase of power and status for the donor (Sherry 1983). Gift-giving may form part of a system of exchange in which the value of counter-gifts are augmented in each round of giving in order to convey social prestige and power (Bourdieu 1970, 1977).

The essential elements in gift exchange are the social ties or obligations that are created or reinforced between the donor and the recipient via the symbolism of the gift. In Chinese *guangxi* networks gifts are the mediators of obligation and reciprocity. The exchange and circulation of gifts in *guangxi* networks are calculated means to gain social capital (Yang 1989, Lew and Wong 2004). Part of the *guangxi* obligations of Chinese tourists is to purchase souvenirs as gifts to maintain or increase their social capital (Guo *et al.* 2009), whereas expatriate ethnic Chinese are expected to occasionally return to China in order to fulfil their *guangxi* obligations, which inevitably involves gift-giving (Lew and Wong 2002).

Of course gift-giving is also important in the West, as Ateljevic and Doorne (2003) demonstrate in their analysis of tie-dyed fabric commodities as gifts from New Zealand tourists. The gifts were used as a strategy for self-identity and social positioning, while at the same time, they connected 'the other' (in terms of the context of production) with the values and life-styles of the 'life worlds of consumers' (Ateljevic and Doorne 2003: 138). The meaning of gifts therefore may extend across geographic and social distance with the associated differences and inequalities and thus create value in a specific context of social relationships.

Charity is a specific form of gift-giving which acts as redistribution of personal capital, as the donor is conscious of socio-economic inequalities and gives charity to contribute to mitigating and addressing these inequalities. Turner *et al.* (2001) distinguish between three types of charities in tourism: 1. charities that work outside the industry and use tourism as a means to raise further funds for their charitable projects not involving tourism, 2. charities working 'above' the tourism industry which seek to influence decision-making on overarching issues such as social justice and sustainable labour conditions, and 3. charities working within tourism i.e. which have charitable tourism projects.

North South Travel, for instance, is an example of a charity that uses tourism as a means to generate funds. As a non-profit UK travel agency, it donates all net profits to development projects in the global South. The UK-based charity Tourism Concern can be classified under the second type of charity in that it aims to influence public policy on such issues as displacement of locals by tourism development, exploitation of workers and environmental damage. It has received considerable attention for its campaign to improve porters' working conditions in the Himalayas, on the Inca Trail in Peru and at Mount Kilimanjaro, Tanzania.

Yet charity in itself is not unproblematic as charities are 'deeply embedded in local social networks of access and exclusion. Indeed, it is impossible to consider these organizations without reference to their position in local social networks' (Bryson *et al.* 2002: 55). In her study of Buddhist charity and merit in northern Thailand, Bowie

(1998) argues that uni-directional transactions such as charity ‘ may be important in mediating the processes of hegemony and resistance in the sociopolitical constitution of complex societies’ (Bowie 1998: 469).

Critical voices argue that charity does not change the structural inequalities that are inherent in mainly capitalist systems, but merely addresses its symptoms:

‘In the modern world, according to its apologists, there is, on the one hand, the world of money, which pretends it has nothing to do with social obligation, and another separate antithetical world, the world of charity where those who have benefited from commerce salve their consciences by “free gifts” to inferiors, an act which they see as in no way caused by an obligation on their part but merely as due to the internal prompting of their consciences.’

(Bloch 1989: 168)

As demonstrated by the quote above, charity may not be free of egotistical meanings, which leads Kosansky (2002: 362-363) to critically assess the ‘facile oppositions between altruism and hierarchy, generosity and self-interest, charity and profit’. In a study on charity in Moroccan Jewish pilgrimage, Kosansky (2002) reveals that the ritual exchange of bidding for candles as charity to honour Jewish saints are performances of wealth and honour involving ‘sacred’ strategies to gain profits in the capitalist economy.

Labour

The analysis of labour in economic exchange systems takes a prime position in political economy. Especially as ‘capitalist societies are underpinned by the antagonistic relationship between capital and labour’ and the ensuing distribution of surplus to the capitalist class (Bianchi 2011: 18). Yet, labour is performed and compensated in different ways resulting in diverse relationships between labour and capital (Gibson-Graham 2006). While the term labour has become almost synonymous with wage labour, there are numerous forms of alternative paid or unpaid labour in tourism. Labour that is ‘paid’ but not compensated according to the labour market is deemed to be alternative pay. Examples include self-employed business people that pay themselves below or above market value, cooperatives that receive capital payments due to the ownership of production, in-kind payments or reciprocal labour.

‘Worldwide Opportunities On Organic Farms’ (Wwoof) uses in-kind compensation for labour as the wwoofer supplies four to six hours (this depends on negotiations with the host) labour per day in exchange for food and accommodation. This is an increasingly popular phenomenon for backpackers in some countries who either want to gain experience and knowledge of organic growing methods, different lifestyles and/or to maximize their travel budget (see McIntosh and Campbell 2001, McIntosh and Bonnemann 2006, Mosedale 2009). Wwoofing is straightforward, as backpackers join the local wwoof organization (this involves a small fee), get access to the database of hosts and contact the host to determine whether there is any work at any given time. Although the simplified exchange is labour for food and accommodation, the success of

the exchange relationship depends on the social interaction between host and wwoofers. Wwoofing is usually a short-term exchange between strangers, so there is an element of uncertainty for both hosts (who are welcoming a stranger into their home) and the wwoofer (who is thrust into someone else's home). While this uncertainty is challenging for many, the complex interplay of unpredictability, alternative lifestyles, being embedded in local culture and cheapness is also part of the attraction. As opposed to formal monetarized transactions (such as staying in youth hostels) or waged labour relations, wwoofing offers a sense of adventure and new and unexpected social experiences (Mosedale 2010).

Examples of unpaid work in tourism include family labour within family-owned SMEs (Shaw and Williams 1990), and voluntary work by volunteers. While unpaid labour receives no monetary compensation, it is usually compensated via social relations (e.g. friendship, love etc.) or an increased sense of self and achievement. In some cases, such as slave labour, which regrettably is still occurring in the sex tourism trade (see Jhappan 2005), labour is not compensated.

Volunteer tourism (often referred to as voluntourism) is one aspect of unpaid labour that has received increased attention in the tourism literature (Campbell and Smith 2006, Halpenny, and Caissie 2003, McGehee and Santos 2004, McIntosh and Zahra 2007, Stoddart and Rogerson 2004, Wearing 2001). Although unpaid labour is at the core of voluntourism, it is far from de commodified as it is often facilitated by fee-charging organizations: 'Some of the most exciting conservation work in Africa from €950 - €1700 (2-4 weeks) ex flights' (responsibletravel.com n.d.). These companies create 'a

space populated by the existence of consumable experiences of “the other”, which is the central commodity for sale’ (Simpson 2004: 683).

The idea that tourism should bring positive impacts to local communities in the destination lies at the heart of voluntourism, yet most academic research in the field focuses on the volunteer experience as multifarious associations between the motivations for engaging in voluntourism (e.g. a means to travelling, a challenge, to gain knowledge and experience or to contribute to the community), the context of the volunteer work, and the relationship with the local community and with fellow volunteers. To date, little regard has been given to power relationships associated with this type of labour. For instance, the relationships between the voluntourists and the local community or between the voluntourist organization (whether a charity or a commercial business) and their local partners, and the meanings that the local community ascribe to the volunteer labour remain unexplored (Sin 2009).

Conclusion: Practicising economies in tourism

In this chapter I have attempted to critique the hegemonic capitalist discourse of a single pervasive capitalist economy and to offer a different view of our economies as open, plural and consisting of a variety of economic practices set in particular social, cultural and political contexts. A focus on practices offers a way to move research on diverse economies forward as practices are the result of individual strategies in the face of social structures and human agency. Unfortunately, a detailed critical analysis of the varied economic practices in tourism was beyond the confines of this chapter, but the

examples provided hopefully demonstrate the diverse economic practices that individuals and institutions engage in and how they actively shape our economies.

The study of alternative economic practices is a promising research area for critical scholars of tourism, hospitality and mobility. Research on alternative economies is largely focused on place-based economies (as geographically fixed communities facilitate the development of trust and reciprocity) and critical tourism scholars could contribute to the wider debates on diverse economies and economic practices in the social science by focussing on alternative economic practices and exchange spaces situated within contemporary mobilities such as wwoofing (Mosedale 2010), house exchanges (Arente and Kiiski 2006) and couch surfing (Germann Molz 2007). Of course, alternative mobile practices are also of interest with reference to empowerment, activism, and resistance to the hegemony of the dominant capitalist economy. At the same time, it is necessary to extend critical questions to and problematize concerns of exploitation and inequality in alternative economic practices.

References

- Adaman, F. and Madra, Y.M. (2002) Theorizing the "Third Sphere": A Critique of the Persistence of the "Economistic Fallacy", *Journal of Economic Issues*, 36(4): 1045-1078.
- Amin, A., Cameron, A. and Hudson, R. (2002) *Placing the Social Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Arente, H. and Kiiski, V. (2006) *Tourist Identity Expression through Postmodern*

Consumption: A Focus on the Home-Exchange Phenomenon. Master thesis No 2005:78. Göteborg University.

Ateljevic, I. and Doorne, S. (2003) 'Culture, economy and tourism commodities: Social relations of production and consumption', *Tourist Studies* 3(2): 123-141.

Bianchi, R.V. (2011) 'Tourism, capitalism and Marxist political economy'. In: J.T. Mosedale (Ed.) *Political Economy and Tourism: A critical perspective*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bloch, M. (1989) The Symbolism of Money in Imerina. In: J. Parry and M. Bloch (Eds) *Money and the Morality of Exchange*. Pp. 165-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Botterill, D. and Jones, T. (2010) *Tourism and Crime: Key Themes*. Woodeaton: Goodfellow.

Bourdieu, P. (1970) 'The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society'. In: J.G. Peristiany (Ed.) *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Pp. 193-241. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowie, K.A. (1998) 'The alchemy of charity: of class and Buddhism in northern Thailand', *American Anthropologist*, 100(2): 469-481.

Bryson, J.R., McGuinness, M. and Ford, R.G. (2002) 'Chasing a 'loose and baggy monster': almshouses and the geography of charity', *Area* 34(1): 48-58.

Campbell, L. M., and C. Smith (2006) What Makes Them Pay? Values of Volunteer Tourists Working for Sea Turtle Conservation. *Environmental Management* 38: 84-98.

- Chung, J.Y., Kyle, G.T., Petrick, J.F. and Absher, J.D. (forthcoming) 'Fairness of prices, user fee policy and willingness to pay among visitors to a national forest', *Tourism Management*.
- Clarke, J. (2008) 'Gifts of tourism: insights to consumer behavior', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2): 529–550.
- De Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- De Croote, P. and Nicasi, F. (1994) Home exchange: an alternative form of tourism and case study of the Belgian market. *The Tourist Review* 49: 22-26.
- Germann Molz, J. (2007) Cosmopolitans on the Couch: Mobile hospitality and the internet. In: J. Germann Molz and S. Gibson (Eds) *Mobilizing hospitality: the ethics of social relations in a mobile world*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (1996) *The End of Capitalism (as we knew it): a feminist critique of political economy*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2002) A diverse economy: rethinking economy and economic representation. Accessed at www.communityeconomies.org Accessed May 2003
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006) *Postcapitalist Politics*, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Guo, Y., Pei, Y., Ye, Y., Chen, Y., Wang, K.-C. and Chan, H.-C. (2009) 'Tourist shopping behavior: a case of Shanghai outbound tourists', *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts* 1(2): 49-66.

- Hall, C.M. (2008) *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Halpenny, E. A., and L. T. Caissie (2003) Volunteering on Nature Conservation Projects: Volunteer Experience, Attitudes and Values. *Tourism Recreation Research* 28: 25–33.
- Henderson, J.C. (2007) ‘Corporate social responsibility and tourism: Hotel companies in Phuket, Thailand, after the Indian Ocean tsunami’, *Hospitality Management* 26(1): 228–239.
- Jhappan, R. (2005) ‘Of tsunamis and child sexual exploitation: the political economy of supply and demand in the sex tourism and trafficking trades’, *Asian women* 20: 137-174.
- Jones, A. and Murphy, J.T. (forthcoming) ‘Theorizing practice in economic geography: foundations, challenges, and possibilities’, *Progress in Human Geography*.
- Kosansky, O. (2002) ‘Tourism, charity, and profit: the movement of money in Moroccan Jewish pilgrimage’, *Cultural Anthropology* 17(3): 359-400.
- Lee, R. and Wills, J. (1997) *Geographies of Economies*, London: Arnold.
- Lew, A.A. and Wong, A. (2004) ‘Sojourners, Gangxi and Clan Associations: Social Capital and Overseas Chinese Tourism to China’, In: D. Timothy and T. Coles (Eds) (2004) *Tourism, Diasporas and Space*, pp. 202-214. London: Routledge.
- Lew, A.A. and Wong, A. (2002) ‘Tourism and the Chinese Diaspora’. In: C.M. Hall and A.M. Williams (Eds) *Tourism and Migration: New Relationships Between Production and Consumption*, pp. 205-219. London: CABI.
- Leyshon, A., Lee, R. and Williams, C.C. (2003) *Alternative Economic Spaces*. London: SAGE.

- Massey, D. (1997) Economic/non-economic, in: R. Lee & J. Wills (Eds) *Geographies of Economies*, pp. 27-36 (London: Arnold).
- McGehee, N. G., and C. A. Santos (2004) Social Change, Discourse and Volunteer Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32: 760–779.
- McIntosh, A. and Bonnemann, S. (2006) Willing Workers on Organic Farms (WWOOF): The Alternative Farm Stay Experience? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 14(1): 82 – 99.
- McIntosh, A. and Campbell, T. (2001) Willing workers on organic farms (WWOOF): A neglected aspect of farm tourism in New Zealand, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 9(2): 111-127.
- McIntosh, A. J., and A. Zahra (2007) A Cultural Encounter through Volunteer Tourism: Towards Ideals of Sustainable Tourism? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 15: 541–556.
- Mosedale, J.T. (2009) Wwoofing in New Zealand as alternative mobility and lifestyle, *Pacific News* 32: 25-27.
- Mosedale, J.T. (2010) Being mobile off the grid: experiencing mobility and alternative economic practices. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers, Washington, D.C. April 14th -18th
- Mosedale, J.T. (2011) ‘Thinking outside the box: Alternative political economies in tourism’. In: J.T. Mosedale (Ed.) *Political Economy and Tourism: A critical perspective*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Pavlovskaya, M. (2004) Other transitions: multiple economies of Moscow households in the 1990s, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 94(2), pp. 329-351.
- Polanyi, K. (2002) The Great Transformation. In: N.W. Biggart (Ed.) *Readings in Economic Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 38-61.

responsibletravel.com (n.d.) *A better way to see the world.*

<http://www.responsibletravel.com/TripSearch/Volunteer%20travel/ActivityCategory100011.htm?gclid=COOnRmsqj6UCFYE14woddncaOQ>. Accessed November 7th 2010.

Reynisdottir, M., Song, H. and Agrusa, J. (2008) 'Willingness to pay entrance fees to natural attractions: An Icelandic case study', *Tourism Management*, 29(6): 1076-1083.

Shaw, G. and Williams, A.M. (1990) Tourism, economic development and the role of entrepreneurial activity. In: C. Cooper and A. Lockwood (Eds) *Progress in Tourism Recreation and Hospitality Management*, London: Belhaven Press, 67-81.

Sherry, J. (1983) 'Gift Giving in Anthropological Perspective', *Journal of Consumer Research* 10: 157-168.

Simpson, K. (2004) 'Doing development': the gap year, volunteer-tourists and a popular practice of development, *Journal of International Development* 16: 681-692.

Sin, H.L. (2009) Volunteer Tourism: 'Involve me and I will learn'? *Annals of Tourism Research* 36(3): 480-501.

Smith, A. and Stenning, A. (2006) Beyond household economies: articulations and spaces of economic practice in postsocialism, *Progress in Human Geography* 30(2): 190-213.

Stoddart, H., and C. M. Rogerson (2004) Volunteer Tourism: The Case of Habitat for Humanity South Africa. *GeoJournal* 60: 311-318.

Thrift, N. & Olds, K. (1996) Refiguring the economic in economic geography, *Progress in Human Geography*, 20(3), pp. 311-337.

Tufts, S. and Milne, S. (1999) 'Museums: A supply-side perspective', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3): 613-631.

Wearing, S. (2001) *Volunteer Tourism: Experiences that Make a Difference.*

Wallingford: CABI International.

White, P.C.L. and Lovett, J.C. (1999) Public preferences and willingness-to-pay for nature conservation in the North York Moors National Park, UK, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 55(1): 1-13.

Williams, C.C. (2005) *A Commodified World? Mapping the Limits of Capitalism*. London: Zed Books.

Williams, C.C. and Nadin, S. (2010) Rethinking the commercialization of everyday life: a 'whole economy' perspective, *foresight* 12(6): 55-68.

Yang, M. M.-H. (1989) The Gift Economy and State Power in China, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 31 (1): 25-54.

Ying, T. and Zhou, Y. (2007) Community, governments and external capitals in China's rural cultural tourism: A comparative study of two adjacent villages, *Tourism Management* 28(1): 96-107.

Table 1: Examples of diverse economies in tourism

| Organizational Form | Transactions | Labour |
|---|--|---|
| <p><i>Capitalist</i></p> <p>Surplus appropriated by owners.</p> | <p><i>Market exchange</i></p> <p>Ruled according to supply and demand, also includes ‘illegal’ economies.</p> | <p><i>Wage labour</i></p> <p>Labour that is remunerated with money according to a labour market (demand and supply of labour).</p> |
| <p><i>Alternative Capitalist</i></p> <p>Maximization of profit is not the only contributing factor for exchange transactions as some of the surplus is distributed to non-producers.</p> <p><i>Ethical tourism</i></p> <p><i>State enterprise</i></p> <p><i>Green capitalist</i></p> <p><i>Corporate social responsibility</i></p> <p><i>Non-profit</i></p> | <p><i>Alternative Market exchange</i></p> <p>Exchange is socially negotiated rather than exclusively subject to supply and demand.</p> <p><i>Home exchange</i></p> <p><i>Voluntary contributions</i></p> <p><i>Couch surfing</i></p> | <p><i>Alternative paid</i></p> <p>Labour that is remunerated (not always monetary) outside of a labour market.</p> <p><i>Self-employed</i></p> <p><i>Cooperative</i></p> <p><i>Reciprocal labour</i></p> <p><i>In kind</i></p> |
| <p><i>Non-capitalist</i></p> <p>Surplus is appropriated by non-producers.</p> <p><i>Communal</i></p> <p><i>Independent</i></p> <p><i>Feudal</i></p> <p><i>Slave</i></p> | <p><i>Non-Market transaction</i></p> <p>No rules of commensurability or equivalence, i.e. the transaction does not require a balanced exchange.</p> <p><i>Gift giving</i></p> <p><i>State funding</i></p> <p><i>Charity</i></p> | <p><i>Unpaid</i></p> <p>Labour that is not remunerated with money, goods or services, yet usually not uncompensated.</p> <p><i>Family work</i></p> <p><i>Volunteer tourism</i></p> <p><i>Slave labour (e.g. prostitution for sex tourism in some cases)</i></p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <i>Deviant transactions (e.g. theft, embezzlement, begging)</i> | |
|--|---|--|

Source: adapted from Gibson-Graham (2006: 71)