

A blind spot? Cultural field perspectives on tourism.

Helgadóttir, Guðrún¹; Haugsevje, Åsne Dahl^{2,3}; Stavrum, Heidi^{2,3}

¹Department of Business and IT, University of South-Eastern Norway, Bø, Telemark, Norway.

²Telemark Research Institute, Bø, Telemark, Norway.

³Religion and Social Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Sports and Educational Science, University of South-Eastern Norway, Bø, Telemark, Norway.

This is an Accepted Manuscript version of the following article, accepted for publication in *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*.

Helgadóttir, G., Haugsevje, Å. D. & Stavrum, H. (2022). A Blind Spot? Cultural Field Perspectives on Tourism. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 52(2), 73-87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2021.1997847>

It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.”



Med mindre annet er angitt, så er denne innførselen lisensiert som Navngivelse-Ikkekommersiell 4.0 Internasjonal

A Blind Spot? Cultural Field Perspectives on Tourism

Left running head: G. HELGADÓTTIR ET AL.

Short title : The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society

[AQ0](#)

[AQ15](#)0000-0002-5001-6452 **Guðrún Helgadóttir**^a  **(Comment by Author:** Guðrún Helgadóttir, Department of Business and IT, School of Business, University of South-Eastern Norway, Bø, Telemark, Norway) **0000-0002-8727-6573** **Åsne Dahl Haugsevje**^{b c} **Heidi Stavrum**^{b c}

^aUniversity of South-Eastern Norway, Bø, Telemark, Norway;

^bTelemark Research Institute, Bø, Telemark, Norway;

^cReligion and Social Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Sports and Educational Science, University of South-Eastern Norway, Bø, Telemark, Norway

CONTACT Guðrún Helgadóttir gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no Department of Business and IT, School of Business, University of South-Eastern Norway, Gullbringvegen 36, 3800 Bø, Telemark, Norway. [AQ1](#)

Abstract

This study addresses a possible mismatch between political rhetoric on creative industries and tourism relations and the experiences and expectations that artists and workers in the creative industries have of their artistic work and their sector. In semi-structured interviews, we asked if and then how creatives and developers in Norway relate to the concept of tourism and whether they see tourists or the tourism industry as a target market for cultural products. Our findings suggest that developers are likely, but creatives unlikely to see a relation between creative's work and tourism or tourists, and the tourism industry as a target market for cultural products. Tourism is in other words a blind spot in the business practices of creative entrepreneurs.

Keywords: Cultural tourism; tourists; creative industries; cultural entrepreneurship Meta interview

Universitetet i Sørøst-Norge;Arctic Studies and Research Fund;Regionale forskningsfond Oslofjordfondet.

Introduction

Around the millennium an optimism reigned regarding the business potential of so-called cultural and/or creative industries (Bell and Oakley 2014; Hesmondhalgh 2013; Pyykkönen and Stavrum 2018). This led to substantial engagement in those industries from public bodies providing support for business startups, cultural entrepreneurship and innovation in the western world. Concurrently the focus within tourism entrepreneurship and innovation lighted on arts and culture, with an emphasis on cultural tourism (Richards 1996; UNWTO 2018).

Tourism is significant for national and local economies as one of the biggest industries in the global market. Tourism based on cultural events and products as a main attraction is a well-established and important niche in the tourism market, generating revenue for both the tourism and cultural industries (Richards 2011). In this article, we discuss the perspective of artists and creative workers on whether tourism is a relevant marketplace for the cultural entrepreneurship that local and national governments have been supporting. Artists, creative workers and cultural entrepreneurs, *creatives* as we choose to call them here, have traditionally not seen economic growth, business and entrepreneurship as primary motivation for artistic and creative

work (Røyseng 2019). This despite that it may be argued that creative industries have an inherently entrepreneurial orientation (Rusak 2016). Many creatives in the field of culture have traditionally identified with ideals such as art for art's sake, intrinsic value, and autonomy of the arts (cf. Belfiore and Bennett 2007; Bourdieu 1993). Due to political highlighting of business potential in the creative industries, these workers face demands for, and offers of support for becoming more entrepreneurial, expanding the business part of their activities (Pyykkönen and Stavrum 2018; Røyseng 2019; Haugesevje et al. 2021). At local, regional and national levels, a support network for creative industries is emerging in Norway, engaging those we call *developers* as consultants, managers and project leaders.

Tourism is often named in policy documents, municipal plans and practices as important for diversification of employment opportunities, business development and resident recruitment, even counted as a creative industry. Tourism policies in Norway emphasize that a rich culture should be promoted in destination development (Kulturdepartementet og Naerings- og fiskeridepartementet 2019; Innovation Norway 2021).

Although the policy rhetoric of creative industries links tourism, creative industries and the cultural sector (Pyykkönen and Stavrum 2018), the relation may be unclear and may not even seem desirable within the two sectors. Kouri (2012:63) questions whether a national policy merging culture and tourism policies is “an opportunity or an unholy alliance.” Richards (2020a:232) asks whether tourism and culture are “natural partners or reluctant bedfellows,” given that after 75 years of courtship the sectors have a love-hate relationship.

This article addresses the possible mismatch between the political rhetoric described above and the views on tourists and the tourism industry expressed by people in the creative industries. We ask the following questions: How do creatives and developers in the creative industries in Norway relate to the concept of tourism? Do they see tourists or the tourism industry as a target market for their products and productions?

Our hypothesis is that tourism is a blind spot in the view that creatives have of their audiences, as most creatives do not see a clear relation between tourism and their own work, and that they do not see tourists or the tourism industry as a target market for their products, while tourism sees cultural products as an attraction. Hence, the empirical findings from our study can shed further light on the claims of Richards (2020a) and Kouri (2012) and contribute to understanding of why the partnership between tourism and culture as intended in cultural and tourism policies malfunctions.

The article is based on qualitative interviews with creatives (artists and cultural entrepreneurs) and developers (project managers) within creative industries in Norway. The interviewees were recruited through their participation in various public and semipublic measures or programs established in order to support and improve the income and work conditions for artists and cultural microbusinesses. Our study is a collaboration by researchers from both tourism and cultural policy research. As our work progressed, we came to suspect that the blind spot mentioned above also exists in the researchers' field of vision. Therefore, a Meta interview in which one of the authors interviewed the two other authors, was conducted. This serves as a secondary, yet important empirical source for this article, that sheds further light on how tourism is understood by actors in the field of art and culture.

Theoretical perspectives

In this section, we start by defining and discussing tourism, the cultural sector and creative industries before moving on to discuss the business development and entrepreneurship emphasis/ideology symptomatic of the various programs that the cultural workers interviewed are engaged in.

Tourism as a field of study

The discourses on tourism can be confusing, as tourism is not only an industry; it is a phenomenon, a field and a social construction (Steen-Jacobsen and Viken 2008). The criteria commonly used to label people as tourists are *time*, being a tourist

is a temporary state; *space or distance*, a tourist is displaced—not at home; *boundary crossing*, an international tourist has crossed national borders, but the domestic tourist has at least crossed his or her own threshold; and *purpose of travel*, the tourist travels with the intention to return after an overnight stay (Cooper and Hall 2016; Robinson 2012; UNWTO, n.d.). Colloquially the term tourist evokes the notion of a person traveling for leisure more so than the business traveler does. Tourism refers to the phenomena, relationships and activities people undertake as/for tourists (Robinson 2012; Vanhove 2017).

On a philosophical level it may be of more interest to discuss the concept of tourist as rhetorical device than the operational definitions of the term, which can be broken down in so many target markets to render the term virtually meaningless. What is of interest to McCabe is the use of the term tourist as an identity marker; often a pejorative one but ultimately a label referring to individual participation in “this vast and dynamic aspect of consumer society, which is tourism” (2009, 26).

Tourism as culture—cultural tourism

On the spectrum between high culture, which can only be defined by distinguishing it from some other culture as low or facile, a distinction tightly bound up with social class, wealth and power, tourism is at the lower end (Bourdieu 1984; Tribe 2009). Popular culture, mass culture is a troublesome category, just as mass tourism that most academics disdain, preferring the loftier concept of traveler to the plebeian term tourist (Wheeler 2009). Cultural tourism that is tourism where culture is an attraction (UNWTO, n.d.) became trendy again around the millennium as described by Helgadottir (2011): “... cultural tourism was all the rage and everybody and their aunt wanted to go into business—usually by opening a ‘museum’” (339). The trend was fraught with taken for granted assumptions about culture as a resource for tourism and vice versa. Yet the UNWTO (2018) continues to promote the synergies between culture and tourism, but now with an understanding of a reciprocal and broad value creation for culture and tourism.

This highlights the importance of tourism understanding as an identity marker or membership category not as separate from culture but as a culture and/or a cultural phenomenon. An even more radical way to conceive of the relation of tourism and culture is proposed by Nogues-Pedregal (2012); by speaking of tourism as the context for cultures and societies, thereby standing the conventional way of thinking about these concepts on its head. The argument is that tourism is a pervasive and overarching force that shapes society and culture.

The cultural approach to entrepreneurship and tourism

A diversity in motivations is not only a consumer trait, lifestyle entrepreneurship is a well-known phenomenon in tourism (Jóhannesson and Lund 2018; Andersson Cederholm and Hultman 2010). For decades, art and culture have been used in placemaking and city branding processes (Boltanski and Esquerre 2020; Richards 2020b). In countries all over Europe arts-led projects and culture based projects led by local public governments have been introduced as tools for attracting visitors, such as tourists (Daniel and Kim 2020; Duxbury 2021). Recent studies have identified different kinds of creative tourists with different motivations (Remoaldo et al. 2020). While tourism actors have been talking about culture and cultural tourism for a long time, tourism has not been on everybody’s lips within art and culture. To understand why, we must address basic principles of the culture field. As early as 1984, Becker discussed art worlds in market terms of resources and distribution and as art mirrors the world, his articulation was timely as the market turn was commencing. According to Bourdieu (1993), the field is structured by the principle of autonomy, which says that art should not have any economic or other external purposes beyond itself. Hence, Bourdieu speaks about the art field as the economic field turned upside down. In the economic field the actors will act in accordance with a calculating, utilitarian interest, while in the art field such commercial self-interest is seen as illegitimate (Bourdieu 1993).

In the era of creative industries, this basic principle has been challenged. Now, the lines between art, culture and economy are blurred and redefined, and creatives (among them artists) are expected to act more like market-oriented entrepreneurs (Naudin 2017; Pyykkönen and Stavrum 2018; Røyseng 2019). Recent studies document that artists respond in various ways to such expectations. Haynes and Marshall (2018) find that even though artists within the music industry act in entrepreneurial ways,

they are reluctant to label themselves as entrepreneurs. Peters and Roose (2020) find that artists since the 90 s have increasingly made use of entrepreneurial logic in their applications for governmental money. Moreover, studies from Norway find that the majority of artists are neither particularly positive nor particularly negative to entrepreneurship, their attitudes are rather pragmatic (Heian and Hjellbrekke 2017). While Bourdieu's analysis of the cultural field is useful to understand the complex relation between art and money, it seems that this relation has become even more complex in the era of the creative industries, as attitudes to entrepreneurship among creatives seem diverse rather than unanimously negative (Haugsevje et al. 2021).

Bourdiesian perspectives are also used in studies of tourism, e.g. when Ritzer and Liska introduce the McTourism concept (1997). The McTourist seeks predictability, standardization and efficient forms of entertainment, rather than novelty, variety and authenticity, as part of what Weber have described as the disenchantment of the world (Rojek 2000, 55–56). Boltanski and Esquerre's study on what they call the enrichment economy (2020, 16), is a recent contribution to cultural sociology, where both tourism and Bourdieu's analyses of the autonomy of the art are discussed in relation to concepts such as late capitalism and the postmodern experience economy. Of particular interest are their reflections on how tourists and travelers become the main target of cultural attractions and experiences. Theoretically the phenomena tourism, cultural tourism, and the concepts of art, culture and creative entrepreneurship are complex and understood differently in different contexts. Here we focus on the understandings of tourism as they are expressed by people working in and with the creative industries.

Methodology, data collection and analysis

This paper grows out of a larger study on creative industries in Norway, in which we have followed seven public or semipublic projects which support artists and micro businesses within cultural and creative industries in different Norwegian cities and villages. To various degrees, city development is also part of the objectives for these projects. The empirical material of our study consists of semi-structured interviews with three categories of people: (1) individuals in charge of the specific projects, (2) bureaucrats within the sectors of culture and trade and industry, and (3) creatives taking part in the seven projects. The creatives represent different parts of the cultural and creative industries, e.g. visual artists, performing artists, musicians, handcrafters, and designers.

In the larger study, 108 individuals were interviewed. In this article, we focus on a selection of 15 interviews with 26 individuals where tourism was explicitly articulated as a theme. Seven of the 26 informants were interviewed individually, while 19 were interviewed in groups of two or three persons. In the analysis we found that the way informants speak about tourism differs between categories. Informants from categories 1 and 2, individuals who have positions in municipalities and/or the business support infrastructure, we collectively name *developers*. Informants from group 3 we have named *creatives*. The category of creatives consists of both artists and people working as creative entrepreneurs in the broader creative industries, all being self-employed and running their own creative businesses. As we will see from the coming empirical sections of the article, the two different groups of informants, the *developers* and the *creatives*, articulate and reflect on the topic of tourism in different ways in different situations.

This is a phenomenological study of the meanings people in the cultural sector attach to tourism and tourists (Berg and Lune 2009). The focus is on the conceptual rather than operational meaning of the terms. True to the qualitative tradition, we acknowledge and use our subjectivity, and take our different positions relative to the topic of study as points of view, as different observation posts in the field. One of the authors of this article (A) comes from the field of tourism studies while the other two (B and C) come from the field of cultural studies. Researchers B and C conducted the interviews of both the larger study on Norwegian creative industries as well as the interviews relevant for this specific study on tourism. In the interview frame, which all three researchers formed together, the theme of tourism was introduced by asking whether and how the different interviewees related to tourism. In addition to analysis of these direct responses, the interviews were also scanned for any other references to tourists and tourism and the responses to other questions were read with a view to what they revealed about target markets and tourism.

The interviews were conducted and transcribed in Norwegian, before a content analysis was conducted on the transcripts. First,

researcher B highlighted all references to tourism in the transcripts. Researcher A followed up and highlighted in addition references to economic aspects such as marketing, business operation and the traveling that the interviewees undertake as well as comments that reflect their professional identity. Researcher A translated the interview citations used in the article from Norwegian to English. Researchers B and C read the translations and compared with sound files and field notes.

Because the two authors representing cultural studies conducted the interviews, the tourism researcher had a need for contextual information beyond the citations and the field notes. To get a better understanding, the tourism researcher (A) conducted a Meta interview with the cultural studies researchers (B and C) about the data collection and methodological work, yielding [supplementary data](#) about the relations between culture, tourism and entrepreneurship, and about the experiences and interpretations happening while interviewing. In this interview researcher A focused also on the emotional charge in the interviews that is what feelings about the topic of tourism were expressed, as well as the non-verbal communication in the meetings between researchers and informants. The Meta interview was a semi-structured interview where A asked B and C specifically what was happening and what they felt at the point in each interview where the topic of tourism was discussed. The interview was recorded and transcribed.

This additional round of analysis was important as the three authors have different relationships to the topic of tourism, which affects the way in which it was approached in the interviews. It served to clarify and contextualize the recorded data as well as collect additional data on the subjective experience, the affect toward the topic. This interview also generated ideas and directions for the data analysis, highlighted themes and issues to re-search in the data.

Empirical findings

In the following section we will analyze the empirical findings on the topic of tourism as it was expressed and discussed in the interviews. Direct citations from interviews appear in italics. The interviewees are indicated by “Creative” or “Developer” and number, and the researchers are indicated by “R.”

Tourism as a tool for development

The developers were primarily interviewed about the local creative industries and the local public actions implemented in order to support such enterprises. Tourism was not planned as a major topic in these interviews, but the developers initiated the topic of tourism as an important part of creative industries and in the context of place attractiveness or place branding and as a market for cultural products, as in this group interview with two developers:

R: Where is [municipality] in the creative industries development in 10 years?

Developer 1: We must be more focused. We start with our tourism policy which touches up to creative industry. [...]

Developer 2: We will have a more deliberate relation to it. [...] I think the municipalities will position themselves more in tourism and creative industries.

Developer 2 explains that the municipalities within the region are branding themselves within different niches. One of the neighboring municipalities is branded as a city of art, another as a city of theater, and their own municipality has chosen music and tourism. He continues to connect tourism and creative industries:

The link between music, food and tourism is interesting. In the future people might ask whether it is tourism, creative industries or what? Then we have done something right. We need more tourism businesses and we need package deals. [...] Gather the industries—retail, festivals, venues and the municipalities. This we have learned from research on music town branding and development.

A team of developers in another city also turn to tourism when being interviewed about how municipalities and regional authorities organize their support for local creative industries:

Developer 3: [Talking about how the current support mechanism in the municipality came about]. It became a project for collocation of tourism.

Developer 4: There has been a focus on tourism since 2012 in the municipality, a separate tourism policy. It has been a red thread that we have made clearer. We want to be better at something we are already relatively good at. Create a milieu to create jobs. [...]

Developer 5: We need an innovation culture here, it doesn't exist. People with ideas that have innovation potential. But we have people working with tourism and creative industries.

The innovation potential in tourism is also about content, and the industry is seen as having to be creative and innovative:

Developer 4: Those that manage to create content are the ones that will succeed from now on [...]. There are some interesting trends emerging. It is worthwhile to focus our efforts there. Here we need to challenge the conventional thinking in tourism: We have the physical infrastructure such as hotels and we have nature and then it is "help yourself, tourist." Those that succeed in creating added value, and can offer the tourists something more, that's what is going to be valuable. A bed and an open ski hill are not good enough today. We are not good enough today and this is the understanding we need to work on here.

The dream includes a more creative tourism industry and there is a hint of impatience toward the conventional way of running tourism on one hand and on conservative ideas about what tourism is and what tourists want:

Developer 5: Here we can build up an innovative tourism. Get younger, alternative thinking people. We have enough businesses run with a traditional mind-set.

Developer 3: People are still asking for a big hotel in town when the world stays in Airbnb.

Developer 4: This is so typical!

The interviews with the developers suggest that they clearly see a strong connection between culture and tourism, even count tourism as a creative industry. In their opinion, creative industries are an obvious provider of cultural content into tourism. Because creative industries may find a market in tourism, successful place branding and tourism policy also are, according to the

developers, important tools in the support of creative industries.

The tourist as an unseen customer

Even though the creatives interviewed in this study take part in projects that aims to make cities more attractive to both visitors and dwellers, they near unanimously categorically denied that they were in the tourism market. In contrast to the developers, they questioned whether a partnership with tourism is likely or feasible as in this interview:

R: Do you actively engage with tourism?

Creative 1: Not as in presenting myself to tourism organizations.

Another interviewee was a bit surprised by the tourism-question:

R: Have you been in contact with tourism? Have any of your performances been targeted to tourists?

Creative 2: Tourism?? [...] No.

R: No? So you, obviously, don't relate to that? You don't sit down and plan to make something that would be relevant for tourists?

Creative 2: No... But that is perhaps because... One thing is that I haven't heard of... Maybe it doesn't really appeal to me. [...] I haven't been very conscious of that being a market, really. What first comes into my head is those people touring at museums and such places. But then at least you need to have a lot of artistic freedom, and not being kind of a tourist guide.

R: But a member of an audience might be a person who has travelled to a city?

Creative 2: Yes. But to produce something in order to be seen, that's no point. One makes a production in order to create art, and then people come to watch it. [...] You have to make art based on an artistic drive, not in order to be seen. [...] The projects you don't care for, they die.

This interview indicates that there is little initiative or motivation from the creative's side to engage with tourism as a market. Tourism has nothing to do with what is at stake for the creatives, and the understanding that a tourist may be a traveling art lover seem not to be present. The term "tourist" rather seems to be associated with the superficial McTourist, persons who are searching for tourist experiences, not serious things like art.

Even artists that produce on commission and sell at Christmas fairs do not see tourism as a market, as in this interview with two creatives working within arts and craft:

R: But do you relate to tourism? Is that representing a market for you?

Creative 3: No.

Creative 4: No, I don't have—you see, the location of my studio—if it was located on the pedestrian street in [the city name], then I am sure I would have had more impulsive buyers dropping in that would see the jewelry. [...]

Creative 3: No, and [the city name] isn't really a tourism town. [...]

R: [...] One thing is Christmas fairs, but there are also museum shops?

Creative 3: We have galleries [the informants start listing galleries and museum shops where their work is for sale].

R: But other than that, tourists are not your market?

Creative 4: No, not tourists.

Creative 3: But definitely, when I worked in [open studio in town nearby] we had very many tourists from [major tourist attraction nearby]. But when people are on holiday with their family, then they don't plan to spend their holiday money on that. Then at least I would have had to produce some cheap stuff.

The phrase “cheap stuff” underlines the notions that the creatives have of the tourists. Tourists are not interested in the real art, the expensive art objects; they are just visiting the town with families, and the “holiday money” are not seen as something the artist could get hold of.

For the creatives, their first instinct is to disassociate from tourism. This is the case even for the informants located in a town where a theme park is a big tourist attraction.

R: Tourism, do you deal with that?

Creative 7: No.

R: The [local theme park]?

Creative 7: Have worked there, yes.

This creative is an actor, and she has been working in the theme park during summers. Still, her associations is that tourism has nothing to do with her artistic work. In another interview, two creatives from the same town engaged in a dialogue on tourism that shows the complex relation and understanding of tourism from the local perspective:

R: Tourism? Is this something you relate to?

Creative 5: I don't know any artists in this town that in any way relate themselves to tourists.

Creative 6: Maybe performing artists that work in the [local theme park].

Creative 5: OK. The [local theme park] spectacle. Tourism... I like to travel, and I like that people travel. But the idea of using tourists as a milking cow, that they should leave as much money as possible on their short stay is totally superficial, it isn't about cultural exchange at all. Very uninteresting for me. I am interested in having international dialogues, but I don't think it fits this

understanding of tourism.

Again, we see how the creatives rhetorically frame tourism and tourists with associations to something “superficial,” as “milking cows” for the town and the theme park. The phrase “spectacle” is used mockingly of tourism as a commercial industry, and it underlines the distance between tourists and the art audiences that these artists want to attract.

As with several of the creatives, creative 5 expresses a very critical view on commercial tourism, while at the same time highlighting that traveling and being international is of relevance to him as an artist. While most informants do not see tourism and tourists as relevant markets for their art work, the creatives do travel. They even like traveling related to their work.

The creatives also host visiting artists when doing international collaborations:

Creative 9: It is a lot of fun when the residency people arrive [gives examples of artists that have been there, tells about dinners, movies etc.]... It is just unbelievably liberating!

While the creatives may not see their customers as tourists, a certain mobility is part of being an art or culture consumer. One of the activities that might attract cultural tourists is visiting artists in their studios, as persons who aspires to build an art collection must be willing to go look for art and the artists ready to host these potential buyers in their studios:

R: But do you think this is representative, that most artists want people visiting their studios?

Creative 9: Absolutely. Very many would like that. To show what has been made and what is there in the studio. If you make an appointment, like with any other office, then that's super, its professional—all artists want... It is part of the job in my mind. I recall I once had a visit from a gallery owner from New York and that was very—[...] it is so healthy. And sometimes it leads to something, other times not, you never know, but these real meetings, that's important.

We note that the creatives do not talk of customers but people who are potential buyers. Even those creatives with an income from commissions do not speak of customers, like in the case with an artisan that makes jewelry for national costumes:

Creative 4: People come here; it is commissioned. They sit down and look at what they would like or maybe they have an idea and we discuss it.

Even if the visitors to the art studios are tourists by operational definitions, they are not framed as such by the creatives. While they all need customers, it seems a long shot to look for them among tourists. The rejection of the tourist as a potential customer by creatives was evident in different fields by visual artists, performing artists and craftspeople across different regional contexts.

Researching the unseen tourist

The experience of tourism as out of place and as something to keep an ironic distance to, is also evident in other parts of our data. In line with our self-reflective ambitions for this article, we have critically addressed our own framing of the interview questions on tourism. Here are examples from two interviews:

R: How is the contact with tourism [chuckle], or tourists? Is this a market for you or the actors?

and:

R: There is a question we ask everybody, which perhaps seem a little off topic. But [chuckle], have you ever been engaged in tourism?

The chuckle here is an interesting affective response, it comes from the researchers who often struggled to approach the tourism questions. The Meta interview where the researcher B and C were informants, uncovered a feeling that they were seen in the

interviews as proponents of the creative industries thinking. Mindful of the concerns in the sector about commodification of culture, bringing up tourism felt like a long stretch in this troubled direction. The informants responded to the questions with laughter and ironic comments:

Tourists are maybe interested in seeing trolls and not art, Creative 2 says laughing, perhaps consciously crass about the tourist relation to art. The key word here is “maybe” as the interviews indicate that the creatives do not see tourists as potential or existing customers. They have only a vague idea of what tourists might need and want. This might also be the case for the researchers, who didn’t quite manage to follow up some of the reflections on tourism without giving the informants a sign of an ironic distance to the subject:

R: Do you have anything to do with tourism?

Creative 10: No.

Creative 11: No.

R: No? [Chuckles] That is just a question we ask everyone.

Creative 11: No, it is very local.

Creative 10: I might have sold some pictures to someone... but I can’t recall.

Again, we see that the interest tourists may show in the work of creatives is acknowledged, but the tourist is not perceived as a target audience.

As noted above, the developers are more aware of tourists and tourism in the conversations with the researchers, such as in this clear statement:

Developer 4: It is the cultural tourist that leaves most money.

But the researchers’ affections toward the subject are also reflected in some of the statements from the developer, such as this:

Developer 8: And they [performers] travel a lot with their performances both inland and abroad and they are in contact with for instance the embassies around the world. But we [administrators] are not in direct contact with tourism except that we have foreign instructors that stay in hotels, so in that way we do support the tourism industry. But that wasn’t really what you meant [laughter].

Whether developers, creatives and researchers are talking about the same tourist is a question, as the creatives and researchers tend to talk of tourists in a rhetorical sense which they do not identify with, while the developers speak of them in an operational sense as potential customers.

Discussion

The topic of tourism was raised in relation to the topic of earning a living from the cultural entrepreneurship and/or artistic work in question. As expected, given the prevailing ideas of tourism as too commercial and culture as noncommercial (Bourdieu 1984, 1993) and the tendency to see tourism as pejorative (Wheeler 2009; McCabe 2009), most respondents among the creatives did not see themselves as producing for the tourism market. These findings are in line with Boltanski and Esquerre’s analysis of the

enrichment economy (2020, 215), where they point out that the Bourdieusian notion of art for art's sake is not only about the artists themselves, but also about the art buyers and art collectors, who need to be of a specific kind in order to protect the autonomy of the art and the artists.

Underlying is the creatives and developers' ideas about culture as an enterprise or in other words a creative industry and cultural tourism as part of this puzzle (Richards 1996, 2018; Kouri 2012). To label their consumers as "tourists" or themselves as tourists during work related travel, seems to be too far out for many creatives. The developers were more likely to adopt an operational definition of the tourist as customer whereas the creatives tended to discuss tourism and tourists in rhetorical terms (McCabe 2009) as something they distanced themselves from.

These findings highlight that for creatives, business may not mean the same thing as business means to the developers. This suggests that further research into the sectors of tourism and culture might benefit from the concept of lifestyle entrepreneurship as there are clear parallels between findings about rural SME's in tourism and cultural work (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000; Andersson Cederholm and Hultman 2010; Helgadóttir and Sigurðardóttir 2008).

When analyzing the relation between tourism and the cultural field, the taken-for-granted views of the empirical field at stake are challenged not only in the analysis of the data, but also in the research process as such. Through a third round of analysis, we uncovered how our research team reflected the different positions taken by the cultural workers toward tourism. Two of the authors have traditionally been studying creative work, artists and creative industries in the practical and theoretical frames of cultural policy studies (Bell and Oakley 2014). The third author is researching tourism, a field that is primarily seen as an industry, while the researcher sees it also as a phenomenon (Jacobsen and Viken 2008) that has much in common with the cultural sector, when it comes to entrepreneurship. Conversely, the cultural field is conventionally viewed as a phenomenon rather than an industry.

Both fields of research have been developed in close relation to the respective industries and the notions present in policy, ideologies and practices among the actors. This is because these fields of research have evolved from a great deal of commissioned and applied research. Critics claim that this can lead to the epistemological problem that the researchers may take the notions and discourses of the empirical field for granted, unable to distance themselves sufficiently to break free from the normative values practiced in the field they research.

Conclusion

We asked how creatives in and developers of the creative industries in Norway relate to tourism and our hypothesis was that tourism is in their blind spot. The short answer is that the hypothesis is partially supported as creatives do not consciously relate to tourism while the developers see this relation and are more likely to define tourism as a creative industry. Another way to put it is to say that the creatives distance themselves from a rhetorical definition of tourism while those working with place promotion and development adopt an operational definition of tourism and tourists.

Further we asked: Do they see tourists or the tourism industry as a target market for their products and productions? We have found that the developers, that is municipal workers and those employed in the support projects and institutions carrying out the creative industry mandate feel more comfortable with the language of business, market and entrepreneurship. They are also open to the idea of tourism as a market for creatives. The creatives themselves are less familiar with the entrepreneurial language as well as the idea of tourism as a relevant market for their work. Even though recent studies (e.g. Duxbury et al. 2020) have identified the emergence of successful creative tourism, our analysis still shows that this is in the creatives' blind spot, regardless of their position in the cultural field. Whether the attitudes to tourism and tourists vary among creatives within different locations in the cultural field or different geographical contexts would be an interesting topic for future comparative research.

The collaboration between researchers from both the fields of tourism and creative industries revealed tourism as a blind spot

also among researchers that are studying this sector. The rhetorical definition of tourists as plebeian and uninterested in culture looms large even in tourism research. Thus, the operational definition of the tourist as a customer in the culture market posited by the developers and cultural tourism promoters remains in the creatives' and even the researchers' blind spot. The consequences of this merit further research. Encouraged by our insights from this study, we claim that more research on the relationship between tourism and culture would benefit from further multidisciplinary research collaborations.

Disclosure statement [AQ2](#)

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors. [AQ3](#)

References

Note: this Edit/html view does not display references as per your journal style. There is no need to correct this. The content is correct and it will be converted to your journal style in the published version.

Andersson Cederholm, Erika, and Johan Hultman. 2010. "The Value of Intimacy—Negotiating Commercial Relationships in Lifestyle Entrepreneurship." *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 10 (1):16–32. doi: 10.1080/15022250903442096. [AQ4](#) [AQ5](#) ↑

Becker, Howard S. 1984. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California. ↑

Belfiore, Eleonora, and Oliver Bennett. 2007. "Rethinking the Social Impacts of the Arts." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (2):135–51. doi: 10.1080/10286630701342741. ↑

Bell, David, and Kate Oakley. 2014. *Cultural Policy*. Oxfordshire: Routledge. ↑

Berg, Bruce L., and Howard Lune. 2009. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Pearson. [AQ6](#) ↑

Boltanski, Luc, and Arnaud Esquerre. 2020. *Enrichment. A Critique of Commodities*. Translated by Catherine Porter. [AQ7](#) ↑

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. ↑

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production. Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press. ↑

Cooper, Chris, and Colin Michael Hall. 2016. *Contemporary Tourism: An International Approach*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge. ↑

Daniel, Jamie Levine, and Mirae Kim. 2020. "Creative Placemaking: Creating Change by Building Partnerships." *Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs* 6 (1):96–110. doi: 10.20899/jpna.6.1.96-110. ↑

Duxbury, Nancy. 2021. "Cultural and Creative Work in Rural and Remote Areas: An Emerging International Conversation." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 27 (6):753–67. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2020.1837788. [AQ8](#) ↑

Duxbury, Nancy, Fiona E. Bakas, Tiago Vinagre de Castro, and Sílvia Silva. 2020. "Creative Tourism Development Models towards Sustainable and Regenerative Tourism." *Sustainability* 13 (1):2. doi: 10.3390/su13010002. [AQ7](#) ↑

Haugsevje, Åsne D., Heidi Stavrum, Mari Torvik Heian, and Gunn Kristin Aasen Leikvoll. 2021. "Bridging, Nudging and Translating: Facilitators of Local Creative Industries in Norway." *International Journal of Cultural Policy*: 1–15. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2021.1895131. [AQ9](#) ↑

Haynes, Jo, and Lee Marshall. 2018. "Reluctant Entrepreneurs: Musicians and Entrepreneurship in the 'New' Music Industry." *The British Journal of Sociology* 69 (2):459–82. doi: 10.1111/1468-4446.12286. [↑](#)

Heian, Mari Torvik, and Johs Hjellbrekke. 2017. "Kunstner og Entreprenør? Norske Kunstneres Holdninger Til Egen Økonomi, Entreprenørskap og Kommersiell Suksess". [Artist and Entrepreneur? Norwegian Artists' Attitudes to Their Own Economy, Entrepreneurship and Commercial Success]. *Norwegian Journal of Sociology* 1 (6):415–35. doi: 10.18261/issn.2535-2512-2017-06-01. [↑](#)

Helgadottir, Gudrun. 2011. "Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies 2nd Edition by Melanie K. Smith." *Journal of Tourism History* 3 (3):339–40. doi: 10.1080/1755182X.2011.628170. [↑](#)

Hesmondhalgh, David. 2013. *The Cultural Industries*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Sage. [↑](#)

Innovation Norway. 2021. *National tourism strategy 2030*. https://assets.simpleviewcms.com/simpleview/image/upload/v1/clients/norway/Nasjonal_Reiselivsstrategi_original_ny_en_cbbfb4a4-b34a-41d4-86cc-f66af936979d.pdf [↑](#)

Jacobsen, Jens K. S., and Arvid Viken. 2008. *Turisme. Fenomen og Naering [Tourism. Phenomenon and industry]*. Oslo: Gyldendal. [↑](#)

Jóhannesson, Gunnar T., and Katrín Anna Lund. 2018. "Creative Connections? Tourists, Entrepreneurs and Destination Dynamics." *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 18 (sup 1):S60–S74. doi: 10.1080/15022250.2017.1340549. [↑](#)

Kouri, Maria. 2012. "Merging Culture and Tourism in Greece: An Unholy Alliance or an Opportunity to Update the Country's Cultural Policy?" *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 42 (2):63–78. doi: 10.1080/10632921.2012.685688. [↑](#)

Kulturdepartementet og Naerings- og fiskeridepartementet. 2019. *Strategi for kultur og reiseliv* [Norwegian ministry of culture and ministry of industries and fisheries, Strategy for culture and tourism]. <https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/76daff482cfc44a79d5ecfa145300ec3/strategi-for-kultur-og-reiseliv-2019-kud-og-nhd.pdf>. [↑](#)

McCabe, Scott. 2009. "Who is a Tourist? Conceptual and Theoretical Developments." In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism*, 25–42. Bristol, UK: Channel View. [↑](#)

Naudin, Annette. 2017. *Cultural Entrepreneurship: The Cultural Worker's Experience of Entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge. [↑](#)

Nogues-Pedregal, Antonio M., ed. 2012. *Culture and Society in Tourism Contexts*. Emerald Group Publishing. [AQ10](#) [↑](#)

Peters, Julia, and Henk Roose. 2020. "From Starving Artist to Entrepreneur. Justificatory Pluralism in Visual Artists' Grant Proposals." *The British Journal of Sociology* 71 (5):952–69. doi: 10.1111/1468-4446.12787. [↑](#)

Pyykkönen, Miikka, and Heidi Stavrum. 2018. "Enterprising Culture: Discourses on Entrepreneurship in Nordic Cultural Policy." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 48 (2):108–21. doi: 10.1080/10632921.2017.1391726. [AQ11](#) [↑](#)

Remoaldo, Paula, Jaime Serra, Noémi Marujo, Juliana Alves, Alexandra Gonçalves, Sónia Cabeça, and Nancy Duxbury. 2020. "Profiling the Participants in Creative Tourism Activities: Case Studies from Small and Medium Sized Cities and Rural Areas from Continental Portugal." *Tourism Management Perspectives* 36:100746. doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100746. [↑](#)

Richards, Greg, ed. 1996. *Cultural Tourism in Europe*. Wallingford: Cab International. [↑](#)

Richards, Greg. 2018. "Cultural Tourism: A Review of Recent Research and Trends." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 36:12–21. doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.03.005. [↑](#)

Richards, Greg. 2020a. "Culture and Tourism: Natural Partners or Reluctant Bedfellows? A Perspective Paper." *Tourism Review* 75 (1):232–4. doi: 10.1108/TR-04-2019-0139. [AQ12](#) [↑](#)

Richards, Greg. 2020b. "Designing Creative Places: The Role of Creative Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 85:102922. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2020.102922. [↑](#)

Ritzer, George, and Allan Liska. 2000. "Chapter 5: 'McDisneyization' and 'Post Tourism': Complementary Perspectives on Contemporary Tourism." In *Touring Cultures. Transformations of Travel and Theory*, edited by Chris Rojek and John Urry, 96–112. London: Routledge. [↑](#)

Robinson, Peter, ed. 2012. *Tourism: The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge. [↑](#)

Rojek, Chris. 2000. "Chapter 3: Mass Tourism or the Re-enchantment of the World? Issues and Contradictions in the Study of Travel." In *New Forms of Consumption: Consumers, Culture, and Commodification*, edited by Mark Gottdiener, 51–70. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. [↑](#)

Røyseng, Sigrid. 2019. "The Social Contract of Artists in the Era of Cultural Industries." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 25 (2):154–17. doi: 10.1080/10286632.2016.1229313. [AQ13](#) [↑](#)

Rusak, Helen. 2016. "Corporate Entrepreneurship in the Arts in Western Australia." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 46 (4):153–63. doi: 10.1080/10632921.2016.1211049. [↑](#)

Tribe, John, ed. 2009. *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Wallingford: Channel View Publications. [↑](#)

UNWTO. 2018. *Tourism and Culture Synergies*. <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/book/10.18111/9789284418978> [↑](#)

UNWTO. n.d. *Tourism Definitions*. <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/epdf/10.18111/9789284420858> [↑](#)


Vanhove, Norbert. 2017. *The Economics of Tourism Destinations: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge. [↑](#)

Wheeller, Brian. 2009. "Chapter 11: Tourism and the Arts." In *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*, edited by John Tribe Bristol, 191–208. Bristol, UK: Channel View. [↑](#)


Author Query

1. **Query:** [AQ0] - : Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution. This check is to ensure that your names will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Guðrún	Helgadóttir	
2		Ásne Dahl	Haugsevje	
3		Heidi	Stavrum	

Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ok 


2. **Query:** [AQ1] - : Please confirm whether the affiliations and corresponding detail presented are appropriate, amend if necessary.

Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: The affiliation should correspond to my contact details, see comment 

3. **Query:** [AQ2] - : Please confirm whether the "Disclosure statement" presented is appropriate, amend if necessary.

Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ok 

4. **Query:** [AQ3] - : Please note that the Funding section(s) has/have been created from information provided through CATS. Please correct if this is inaccurate.


Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ok 

5. **Query:** [AQ4] - : Please provide complete details for (Richards 2011, Richards 2020, Ateljevic and Doorne 2000, and Helgadóttir and Sigurðardóttir 2008) in the reference list or delete the citation from the text.

Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ateljevic, Irena, and Stephen Doorne 2000. "Staying within the fence": Lifestyle entrepreneurship in tourism." Journal of sustainable tourism 8, (5): 378- 392.doi.org/10.1080/09669580008667374

Helgadóttir, Guðrún, and Ingibjörg Sigurðardóttir, 2008. "Horse-based tourism: Community, quality and disinterest in economic value". Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 8(2): 105-121. doi.org/10.1080/15022250802088149


Richards, Greg. 2011. "Creativity and tourism: The state of the art." Annals of tourism research, 38(4): 1225-1253. doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.07.008

Richards is cited as 2020a and 2020b respectively. 

6. **Query:** [AQ5] - : There is no mention of (Becker 1984, Richards 2020a, 2020b, and Ritzer & Liska 2000) in the text. Please insert a citation in the text or delete the reference as appropriate.

Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: These are all cited in the text. 

7. **Query:** [AQ6] - : Please provide the publisher location.

Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: London, UK 

8. **Query:** [AQ7] - : Please provide the publisher location and publisher name.

Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Cambridge, UK. Polity. 

9. **Query:** [AQ8] - : The year of publication has been changed as per Crossref details both in the list and in the text for this reference. Please check.
Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ok [↑](#)
10. **Query:** [AQ9] - : The year of publication has been changed as per Crossref details both in the list and in the text for this reference. Please check.
Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ok [↑](#)
11. **Query:** [AQ10] - : Please provide the volume number.
Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Tourism Social Science Series Volume 17 [↑](#)
12. **Query:** [AQ11] - : Please provide the publisher location.
Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Bingley, UK. [↑](#)
13. **Query:** [AQ12] - : The year of publication has been changed as per Crossref details both in the list and in the text for this reference. Please check.
Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ok [↑](#)
14. **Query:** [AQ13] - : The year of publication has been changed as per Crossref details both in the list and in the text for this reference. Please check.
Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Ok [↑](#)
15. **Query:** [AQ15] - : Please note that the ORCID section has been created from information supplied with your manuscript submission/CATS. Please correct if this is inaccurate.
Response: [Author - Guðrún Helgadóttir: gudrun.helgadottir@usn.no]: Heidi Stavrum orcid id is 0000-0003-4292-5063 [↑](#)

Comments

1. **Comments** [Author - 11/4/2021 12:20:28 AM]: Guðrún Helgadóttir, Department of Business and IT, School of Business, University of South-Eastern Norway, Bø, Telemark, Norway [↑](#)