Labour migration and tourism mobilities: Time to bring sustainability into the debate

Noel B. Salazar

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Labour migration and tourism mobilities: Time to bring sustainability into the debate

Noel B. Salazar [iD]

Social and Cultural Anthropology, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

ABSTRACT

Migration and tourism are interconnected forms of human mobility, similar but different. It is impossible to draw neat boundaries around the two because they constantly intersect, sometimes within one and the same individual. Tourism and migration often fuel each other, thereby raising two interesting questions that are rarely asked, namely 'What would tourism be without migration?' and 'What would migration be without tourism?'. In significant ways, sustainability is directly related to the 'mobility' aspects of tourism-related labour. However, in tourism studies, research on mobility often focuses merely on tourist movements. In general, there has been little detailed examination of the mechanisms that comprise and (re)produce the border-crossing movements of tourism labourers. If there is little attention to tourism-related labour mobilities, considerations related to the sustainability implications of worker mobility are highlighted even less often. Indeed, despite the anthropocentric focus of sustainability as a concept, surprisingly little attention has been devoted to the aspect of social sustainability. As the COVID-19 crisis shows, when it comes to the nexus between migration and tourism, the current and future challenges are huge.

摘要

迁徙和旅游是相互联系的人类流动形式, 相似但不同。要在两者之间划清界限是不可能的, 因为它们时常交叉, 有时可归为一类, 有时一个人既迁徙又旅游。旅游和迁徙经常相互推动, 因此提出了两个很少被问及的有趣问题, 即"如果没有迁徙, 旅游会怎么样?"以及"如果没有旅游, 迁徙又会怎么样?"在很大程度上, 可持续性与旅游劳工的"流动性"直接相关。然而, 在旅游研究中, 对流动性的研究往往只关注于游客的流动。总体而言, 对于组成和(重新)生成旅游劳工跨境流动的机制, 几乎尚未进行详细的考察过。如果很少注意与旅游有关的劳工流动, 那么就更不经常凸显与工人流动可持续性有关的考量。事实上, 尽管可持续发展是一个以人类为中心的概念, 但令人惊讶的是, 很少有人关注社会可持续性层面。新冠肺炎危机表明, 就移徙和旅游之间的关系而言, 当前和未来的挑战都是巨大的。

CONTACT Noel B. Salazar ✉ Noel.Salazar@kuleuven.be

Have you ever wondered, when you board a means of transport, where everybody else is going and for which reasons? I have. In fact, I try to ask fellow passengers as soon as the opportunity arises. Particularly planes can contain an incredible mix of travellers. The unprecedented degree of mobility in contemporary society—when not hindered by unforeseen external factors such as COVID-19—is believed to challenge traditional values, including people's attachment to places.[1] So much of social theory is predicated on the thesis of authenticity versus alienation that 'it has been hard to imagine a multicentred world in which movement and mobility play as much of a constituting role in society as more traditionally place-based notions of settlement, territory and community identity' (Williams & Van Patten, 2006, p. 33). While scholars traditionally tended to ignore or regard boundary-crossing journeys as deviations from normative place-bound communities, cultural homogeneity, and social integration, discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism (that became dominant since the end of the Cold War) shifted the pendulum in the opposite direction (Salazar, 2013a).

People across the globe have long been interconnected; populations often have been mobile; and their identities have long been fluid, multiple, and contextualized. My own family and personal history are deeply marked by multiple mobilities and border crossings. In the early 1970s, my Flemish mother travelled as a young tourist to the Costa del Sol (or 'Sun Coast'), in the south of Spain. Formerly made up of a series of small fishing settlements, the region was converted in the 1960s into a world-renowned beach tourism destination. Like many others living in the *pueblos blancos* ('white villages') a short distance inland in the mountains running down to the coast, my father found employment in the hospitality sector and worked as a hotel receptionist at the time he met my mother. This encounter, in turn, led my Spanish father to migrate to Bruges, Belgium, another famous tourism hotspot. I was born in between, in France, and spent most of my formative years shuttling between Belgium and Spain.

So it is not all that surprising that I ended up doing research on the interconnections between various forms of human border-crossing mobilities (Salazar, 2018). In 2006, for instance, I had the opportunity to visit the remote island of Sumba in eastern Indonesia. At the time, I was conducting ethnographic fieldwork on tourism on the island of Java. The trip to Sumba had been carefully planned because there were only two flights per week with a small propeller plane. Nuri, an old-time Indonesian friend with whom I had studied anthropology in Belgium and who was a native from Sumba, gave an ethnographic tour of the island. On the day of departure, I experienced first-hand what it meant to be 'involuntary immobile', stuck on an island. The Tambolaka airfield was full of agitated people because the flight had been cancelled and nobody could tell when the next plane would come. I was among only a handful of foreigners, along with a French film crew and some lost tourists, who were all annoyed with the fact that their travel itineraries had been heavily disturbed.

Sumba is one of the poorer islands of Indonesia. Most people at the airfield were Sumbanese women who work abroad as migrant labourers, including in the hospitality industry. They had visited relatives in their native villages. For these poor women, the cancellation of the flight had potentially catastrophic consequences. Arriving a couple of days late for work in Malaysia or Singapore could mean the termination of their

contract. In other words, even if we were all to take the same plane, their freedom of movement was structurally much more limited than the tourists and others present (Abram et al., 2017).

While mobility was not the focus of my research back then, human movement was evident all around me (Salazar, 2011a). I witnessed, for example, the seasonal flows of tourists and how local tourism service providers were looking for short-term employment abroad during the low season—work on cruise ships or in large hotels—Europe or the United States being popular options. In 2010, I attended the Annual Meeting of the Society for Economic Anthropology in Tampa, Florida. The topic of the conference was 'Contested Economies: Global Tourism and Cultural Heritage'. I therefore thought it fitting to pay a visit to the Port of Tampa, a well-known cruise ship terminal. I witnessed the docking of the MS Carnival Inspiration, a fourteen-deck vessel with the capacity to carry 3,450 passengers and a crew of 920 people. I was particularly interested in the latter population. As passengers were disembarking, I observed many crew members hurrying to the local bars near the cruise port. Outside Hooters, I met several Indonesian and other Asian men. They were not really interested in what was going on inside the bar but wanted to capture the free Wi-Fi signal to communicate with their families back home.

A year later, I was reminded of this encounter while I was interviewing a Romanian woman who founded *Miami*, a school for cruise ship training in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, and who was now running a cruise crew recruitment agency. She herself had worked on a Carnival cruise ship, where she met her future Indonesian husband. She confirmed that many people she recruited were young men, including some of the tour guides I had previously studied (Salazar, 2010). Their main motivation was economic (although they also liked the travel aspect of the job). Because of their limited command of English, most of them ended up doing jobs on board that required little contact with passengers.

This anecdotal evidence serves to illustrate how migration and tourism are interconnected, similar but different forms of mobility. It is impossible to draw neat boundaries around the two because they constantly intersect (Hall & Williams, 2002), sometimes within one and the same person. Many would-be migrants, for example, enter countries on tourist visas. In other instances, tourism and migration become much enmeshed in a certain location. Just think of places such as the islands in the Mediterranean that serve both as tourist destinations and migrant stop-overs (or temporary destinations, in case people get stuck). Moreover, the housing of asylum seekers in Europe usually is organized in accommodations that are often an integral part of the tourism infrastructure (guesthouses, pensions, hostels, and hotels). Because of this practice, tourism spaces are linked with spaces of (forced) migration in various ways.

The connection between tourism and migration is much more intimate than that. At the beginning of the new millennium, Alan Williams and Michael Hall (2002) identified three different mechanisms that link tourism with migration: (1) the tourism-led migration hypothesis (tourism leads to migration, both for employment and consumption); (2) the migration-led tourism hypothesis (migration leads to tourism visiting friends and relatives); and (3) a mutually reinforcing mechanism that accounts for the

bidirectional flows between tourism and migration. Undoubtedly, both forms of mobility fuel each other, thereby raising two interesting questions. The first one is 'What would tourism be without migration?' Well, global tourism organized at the massive scale we have known until now is impossible without the availability of both a numerically substantial and functionally flexible workforce of migrant workers. The labour-intensive and casual nature of tourism accentuates the role of various economic sectors, most of which are loosely grouped under the term 'hospitality industry' (particularly hotels and restaurants), as a magnet for migrant labour. Given the increasing transnational nature of tourism, it is hardly surprising that tourism employment is 'cosmopolitan' in nature (Salazar, 2017), although there are clear differences related to age, ethnicity, and gender (Bianchi, 2000). A tourism workforce that is mobile offers 'a solution to labour shortages where the local workforce is not willing to engage in low pay, low status and seasonal employment' (Janta et al., 2011, p. 1323).

This brings us to the second question: 'What would migration be without tourism?' Not only does tourism provide migrant labour, many migrants are also partly inspired by tourism-related imaginaries to plan their migratory itineraries (Salazar, 2010). In the cultural logics of migration, imaginaries play a predominant role in envisioning the green grass on the other side (Salazar, 2011b). Not surprisingly, many of these imaginaries are circulated through tourism and its various stakeholders. Moreover, mobile lifestyles evolve not just to explore economic opportunities not available locally but also to pursue particular types of culturally and socially desirable livelihoods, what is better known as 'lifestyle migration' (Benson & Osbaldiston, 2014) or 'lifestyle mobility' (Cohen et al., 2015).

Even if tourism and migration often overlap, in practice tourist and migrant movements are governed by very different regimes of mobility (Salazar & Glick Schiller, 2014). By using mobility as an analytical lens, scholars became more aware of this. It is not because one focuses attention on the 'fluid' aspects of society that societal structure disappears entirely (Salazar, 2016). Barriers to border-crossing movements typically increase after big 'crises' and are accompanied by the counter narrative of securitization. Just think of 9/11 in the United States, the 2015 refugee influx and terrorist attacks in the EU and the 2020 global crisis caused by COVID-19. In the context of the tourism labour market, the differential regimes are partially related to the type of people that are employed. Tourism largely relies on 'low-skilled' workers (having skills that are not highly valued) and workers with few qualifications in general, people belonging to (ethnic) minorities, unemployed youngsters, people who are long-term unemployed, and people (mostly women) who can only commit to part-time jobs because of responsibilities within the family. It are mostly those groups that are hit hardest in times of crisis. The high labour mobility is not only related to the seasonality of tourism activities but also to the high turnover of staff joining and leaving the sector (Bookman, 2006).

Sometimes the differences between tourism and migration regimes of mobility become very visible. From 1999 until 2012, for example, all *Tenaga Kerja Indonesia* (TKI) or '(overseas) Indonesian labour migrants' had to use the special Selapajang Terminal at Soekarno-Hatta International Airport in Jakarta. This terminal was located at a distance from the other airport terminals. Return migrants were welcomed back

as *pahlawan devisa* (foreign exchange heroes) because of the remittances they brought with them. The aim of creating a separate terminal for Indonesian migrant workers was to protect them against corrupt money changers or transportation operators. In practice, however, separating these people in a distant terminal only made them more vulnerable.

Given this general context of migration and tourism mobilities, many issues of sustainability arise. In the remainder of this article, then, I want to focus on the questions of sustainability that are directly related to the 'mobility' aspects of tourism labour. I conceptualize mobility here as a complex assemblage of movement, social imaginaries, and experience (Salazar, 2013b). As a sociocultural anthropologist, I am particularly interested in the culturally inflected meanings, values, and impacts of mobilities. Moving beyond the conventional approach to human movement in clearly delineated subfields (e.g. migration and tourism studies), I want to address the normalization of certain boundary-crossing movements and the relations of differential power that are generative of these mobilities, their representations, and their societal significance.

Tourism-related labour mobilities

In tourism, studies of human mobility are often limited to tourist movements. Through their 'Statistics and Tourism Satellite Account Programme', for instance, UNWTO has very detailed data on 'international arrivals' across the globe. Unfortunately, the data on the mobility of workers who make tourism possible are much less detailed. In general, there has been little thorough examination of the mechanisms that comprise and (re)produce the border-crossing movements of tourism-related labourers. As Raoul Bianchi noted already two decades ago, 'There are a few notable exceptions, which encompass a relatively broad spectrum of tourism-related migration, but which for the most part are concerned with the more familiar category of *labour* migration as opposed to transient resort workers who do not fit easily into the category of either tourist or migrant' (2000, p. 112). This is remarkable because waves of temporary migration in the tourism sector are not at all new. Tom Baum (2006) traces examples of vocational mobility in the sector in Europe back to the 13th century.

There are many categories of mobile tourism workers. Doris Anna Carson and colleagues (2014, p. 359), for example, describe the following categories: (1) migrant tourist workers (who have mostly lifestyle-related motivations and repetitively travel between places and jobs); (2) practiced seasonal workers (who combine seasonal tourism work with jobs during off season elsewhere and have relatively predictable cyclical patterns of mobility); (3) working-holiday tourists (who chase temporary work opportunities to earn income while travelling the world); (4) temporary seasonal workers (who have more random work patterns and may engage in seasonal tourism work as a one-off opportunity, usually for economic reasons); (5) hobbyists (who work in tourism to satisfy personal leisure interests); and (6) place-attached seasonal workers (who live in the seasonal workplace or have prior connections to the place through family ties or previous tourist experiences). These categories, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive, emphasize the complex, and often blurred, relationships between tourism, work, and labour migration (Bianchi, 2000).

The social sustainability of tourism-related labour mobilities

If there is little attention to tourism-related labour mobilities, 'considerations related to the sustainability implications of worker mobility and migration are highlighted even less often' (Baum et al., 2016, p. 7). The concept of sustainable development was developed alongside the heightened consciousness that ecological devastation, together with a 'retreat from social concerns' (e.g. poverty), is untenable (WCED, 1987, p. xi). Even if the original sustainable development concept included a clear social focus, for the first decades 'this human dimension has been neglected amidst abbreviated references to sustainability that focused on bio-physical environmental issues, or was subsumed within a discourse that conflated "development" and "economic growth"' (Vallance et al., 2011). The social aspects started receiving far more global attention through the UN's Millennium Development Goals (2001-2015) and Sustainable Development Goals (2016-2030), the latter now being criticized by some for being too weak on environmental sustainability.

As Nicola Dempsey and colleagues note, 'Social sustainability is a wide-ranging multi-dimensional concept, with the underlying question "what are the social goals of sustainable development?", which is open to a multitude of answers, with no consensus on how these goals are defined' (Nicola et al., 2011, p. 290). In 2005, the United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations World Tourism Organization jointly released a guide for policy makers, entitled *Making Tourism more Sustainable* (UNEP/UNWTO, 2005). This guide describes social sustainability as 'respecting human rights and equal opportunities for all in society', requiring 'an equitable distribution of benefits, with a focus on alleviating poverty' (UNEP/UNWTO, 2005, p. 9). Important is the 'emphasis on local communities, maintaining and strengthening their life support systems, recognizing and respecting different cultures and avoiding any form of exploitation' (UNEP/UNWTO, 2005, p. 9).

In terms of the nexus between migration and tourism, the current and future challenges are huge. For the Asia-Pacific region, for example, the diametrically opposed mobility trends of tourists and migrants have been pointed out (Robinson et al., 2014). According to Richard Robinson et al., many tourists in this region are attracted by 'isolated' (remote) destinations. However, the global trend towards urbanization draws the workforce to metropolitan areas. These two trends 'create major challenges for the tourism industry, which faces a growing demand for labour in both areas where there is growing labour supply but without skills (untrained agricultural workers migrating to core megacities) and where there is a shrinking labour supply of all employees (pleasure periphery)' (Robinson et al., 2014, p. 806). It is clear, however, that in a post-COVID-19 world peripheral destinations will have a hard time because the mobilities of both tourists and tourist workers will be more complicated. More central locations, on the other hand, may be avoided because they concentrate too many people.

Worryingly, sustainable tourism planning and development in general is threatened by quickly spreading neoliberal ideas of resilience. Resilience in general refers to the ability to resist and recover from aversity or disaster. When resilience is missing, crises will be suffered as unsettling; when resilience is robust, a crisis will be experienced more smoothly. Alan Lew notes how the planning of resilience has emerged as an alternative to the sustainable development paradigm. The difference between the two

is that 'sustainability mitigates or prevents change by maintaining resources above a normative safe level, whereas resilience adapts to change by attempting to build capacity to return to a desired state following both anticipated and unanticipated disruptions' (Lew, 2014, p. 14). Sustainability emphasizes 'aspirational goals associated with the careful use of resources and ensuring provision for future generations' while resilience is 'pragmatic and inclusive of a range of responses that may or may not align with sustainability principles' (Espiner et al., 2017, p. 11). The neoliberal framing of resilience is a way to maintain the status quo: it wants people to be prepared against any aversity or disaster that come their way instead of working towards systemic change.

Since the late 1990s, many stakeholders involved in tourism have addressed issues of sustainability. More recently, they have started looking into capacity development (resilience), so that the tourism sector is ready to respond to various types of disaster. However, as Stephen Espiner and colleagues argue, 'Few … have demonstrated a capacity to adapt to incremental threats to their longevity (sustainability). In the tourism literature, there is considerable emphasis on resilience to the immediate challenges (local impacts, disasters or financial shocks, for instance), yet there is merit in conceptualizing resilience as a dynamic long-term state, where there are obvious parallels with the sustainability concept.' (Espiner et al., 2017, p. 2). While destinations may manage to be resilient without being sustainable, the opposite is not workable. In other words, in order to be sustainable, they also need to be resilient. The post-COVID-19 period will offer a natural laboratory to study and compare tourism destinations in which principles of sustainability and/or resilience are applied in different ways. For one, how will destinations deal with the predicted loss of (migrant) jobs, particularly in tourism?

The question what constitutes sustainable tourism becomes even more complex when we take labour migration into account. Even if the absolute numbers of labour mobilities may be small, they can raise delicate issues locally that need to be considered when assessing the value of tourism as a local development tool (Carson et al., 2014). Examples include the lack of local integration of 'enclave' labour communities, regular economic and knowledge leakages due to high labour turnover, and the lack of long-term opportunities for a more stable and locally based workforce (Tuulentie & Heimtun, 2014). Indeed, skilled migrant workers, particularly those who settle, can actually 'displace' local workers (Schellhorn, 2010). The problem is that there is not one global model of sustainability that can be easily applied in all tourism contexts (or that too many so-called experts have unsuccessfully tried this around the world in the past). How to make tourism and its labour-related migration (more) sustainable is dependent on many context-specific variables. In other words, every destination may need a strategy with different accents.

Another issue is that increasing migrant mobility and the presence of greater numbers of migrants in a tourism destination also carries consequences for tourism in terms of the product and experience offered to tourists and the imaginary they cultivate of a destination (Salazar, 2012). Migrants employed in 'front-of-house' positions interact with the local community as well as domestic and international tourists (Janta et al., 2011, p. 1339). Interestingly, those workers play the role of 'host' for

international tourists. In the case of new arrivals, migrants thus play a double role: they are 'the migrant-guest', but they are also 'migrant- host' to those they serve in tourism. A similar blurring of categories occurs in the case of tourists (often of the 'backpacker' type) who stay longer at a destination and temporarily work in tourism as a way to fund their travels. In other words, the many cross-overs between migration and tourism also put into question the often-used host-guest paradigm. More importantly, perhaps, they make us reflect on the various meanings of 'hospitality' (both within tourism and beyond).

Conclusion

In-depth research on the situated articulations between culturally inflected regimes of movement, mobility representations, and ideas about tourism and migration is a fruitful way for analysing the dynamic tension between ongoing processes of mobility and fixity. It is necessary, for instance, to understand tourism and migration within the context, and as counter-veiling forces, of a broader reading of globalisation and of uneven and unequal development (Mowforth & Munt, 2016). While the frontiers of tourism are dismantled through the liberalisation of the service sector, the *cordon sanitaire* against migration to the developed economic core is tightened, even though migrants' remittances are, in some cases, more significant than earnings from tourism. At the same time, crises such as the one caused by COVID-19 can quickly unsettle these mechanisms and processes. By juxtaposing migration and tourism mobilities we emphasise the framework of global unevenness and inequality in which all forms of human movement must be contextualised and are conditioned. Whilst many global migrants are relocating for work, family and/or lifestyle, many others have very little choice of when and where to go as they flee their homes as equally diversely displaced refugees. Climate change and future crises and disasters will only exacerbate forms of forced mobility.

The connections between migration and tourism (and vice versa) have become increasingly important 'because of significant shifts in the role that migration plays in the international political and economic order and the consequent shifting definitions of what constitutes a migrant (and tourist) in the twenty-first century' (Lovelock & Leopold, 2011, p. 139). However, although increasingly attracting research attention, there are aspects that remain poorly investigated. How, for one, can we ensure that regimes of mobility do not disrupt, but rather, facilitate and support the mobilities and livelihoods of local populations, especially the poor and vulnerable?

An issue that urgently requires our attention and research is the impact of human mobility and everything that comes with it. This impact is becoming continuously greater because of the number and frequency of human movements across the planet and because of the (polluting) means of transport used. In general, the whole (environmental) sustainability argument seems to have very limited impact on how most people imagine, experience, and value translocal mobilities. This is a huge challenge, one that will only grow in the future. Regrettably, the COVID-19 crisis has pushed the problem of climate change somewhat out of the spotlight (despite the fact that

climate change exacerbates the risk of pandemics), but it has made more people reflect on how and why we move across the planet and how unsustainable this all is.

Within tourism, too, there is much thinking about how the future of the sector should look like. It is of crucial importance to include considerations regarding the tourism-migration nexus. Sustainable tourism workforce mobility requires 'coordinated and integrated policy and planning approaches at the local, regional, national and even transnational levels' (Baum et al., 2016, p. 8). Moreover, 'any discussion about career management and turnover in tourism organizations in specific locations must be seen within the contemporary understandings of vocational mobility and global migration patterns'(Baum et al., 2016, p. 9). As I pointed out earlier, unfortunately there is not an easy one-type-fits-all solution. Even best practices or successful examples are not to be blindly copied (although they may certainly give inspiration). Because of the particularities of each destination or setting in which tourism and its related labour migration are embedded, we need detailed studies and the involvement of as many stakeholders as possible to work towards 'sustainable' sustainable tourism development.

Humans have always been mobile. People are on the move in multiple directions. There is no single model or grand theory that can explain the complexity of human mobility, certainly not on a global scale. This implies that we need to pay much more attention, both in research and praxis, to alter-native (particularly non-western) understandings of mobilities that are commonly labelled as 'tourism' and 'migration' (Adams, 2020). The mobility experience that many people aim for is less about regularly moving back and forth between 'home' and 'elsewhere', but encompasses a broader understanding of movement, which includes a variety of locations that emerge and/or are abandoned organically in an individual's life trajectory. Therefore, a semiotic analysis of mobility seems in place, a non-binary inquiry into the meanings of home, of being away, and the consequences certain articulations of home, mobility, and the wider world might have for the constructions of self and place (Teampău & Van Assche, 2009). Or, in the words of anthropologist Tim Ingold (2011, p. 12), 'We need a different understanding of movement: … not the *trans-port* (carrying across) of completed being, but the *pro-duction* (bringing forth) of perpetual becoming'.

Note

1. This article is based on a keynote speech I gave for the 'Nexus of Migration and Tourism: Creating Social Sustainability Symposium' at VNU University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Hanoi, Vietnam in September 2018. I thank Long Hong Pham and his team at VNU for the invitation and Jaeyeon Choe from Bournemouth University in the UK for facilitating the contact, the intellectually stimulating exchanges and the pleasant company. As the revision of the article happened in the middle of the 2020 coronavirus pandemic, reflections relating to COVID-19 were added at that stage.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Noel B. Salazar is Research Professor in Anthropology at KU Leuven, Belgium. He is co-editor of *Tourism Imaginaries* (2014) and author of *Momentous Mobilities* (2018), *Envisioning Eden* (2010) and numerous peer-reviewed articles and book chapters on tourism and mobility. Salazar sits on the editorial boards of, among others, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* and *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*. In addition, he is past chair of the IUAES Commission on the Anthropology of Tourism and serves as an expert member for the European Parliament's Committee on Transport and Tourism (TRAN), the ICOMOS Cultural Tourism Committee (ICTC) and the UNITWIN-UNESCO Network 'Culture, Tourism and Development'.

ORCID

Noel B. Salazar (iD) http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8346-2977

References

Abram, S., Feldman Bianco, B., Khosravi, S., Salazar, N. B., & de Genova, N. (2017). The free movement of people around the world would be Utopian. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 24(2), 123–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2016.1142879

Adams, K. M. (2020). What western tourism concepts obscure: intersections of migration and tourism in Indonesia. *Tourism Geographies*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1765010

Baum, T. (2006). *Human resource management for tourism, hospitality and leisure: An international perspective*. International Thomson.

Baum, T., Cheung, C., Kong, H., Kralj, A., Mooney, S., Nguyễn Thị Thanh, H., Ramachandran, S., Dropulić Ružić, M., & Siow, M. (2016). Sustainability and the tourism and hospitality workforce: A thematic analysis. *Sustainability*, 8(8), 809. https://doi.org/10.3390/su8080809

Benson, M., & Osbaldiston, N. (Eds.). (2014). *Understanding lifestyle migration: Theoretical approaches to migration and the quest for a better way of life*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Bianchi, R. V. (2000). Migrant tourist workers: Exploring the contact zones of post-industrial tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 3(2), 107–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500008667869

Bookman, M. Z. (2006). *Tourists, migrants & refugees: Population movements in Third World development*. Lynne Rienner.

Carson, D. A., Carson, D. B., & Lundmark, L. (2014). Tourism and mobilities in sparsely populated areas: Towards a framework and research agenda. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(4), 353–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2014.967999

Cohen, S. A., Duncan, T., & Thulemark, M. (2015). Lifestyle mobilities: The crossroads of travel, leisure and migration. *Mobilities*, 10(1), 155–172. https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2013.826481

Espiner, S., Orchiston, C., & Higham, J. (2017). Resilience and sustainability: A complementary relationship? Towards a practical conceptual model for the sustainability–resilience nexus in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(10), 1385–1400. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1281929

Hall, C. M., & Williams, A. M. (Eds.). (2002). *Tourism and migration: New relationships between production and consumption*. Kluwer.

Ingold, T. (2011). *Being alive: Essays on movement, knowledge and description*. Routledge.

Janta, H., Brown, L., Lugosi, P., & Ladkin, A. (2011). Migrant relationships and tourism employment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1322–1343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.03.004

Lew, A. A. (2014). Scale, change and resilience in community tourism planning. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2013.864325

Lovelock, K., & Leopold, T. (2011). The political economy of temporary migration: Seasonal workers, tourists and sustaining New Zealand's labour force. In J. Mosedale (Ed.), *Political economy of tourism* (pp. 139–156). Routledge.

Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2016). *Tourism and sustainability: Development, globalisation and new tourism in the Third World* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Nicola, D., Glen, B., Sinéad, P., & Brown, C. (2011). The social dimension of sustainable development: Defining urban social sustainability. *Sustainable Development*, *19*(5), 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.417

Robinson, R. N. S., Ritchie, B. W., Kralj, A., Solnet, D. J., Baum, T., & Ford, R. C. (2014). An Asia-Pacific core–periphery futures paradox: Divergent worker and tourist mobilities. *Journal of Travel Research*, *53*(6), 805–818. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513513164

Salazar, N. B. (2010). *Envisioning Eden: Mobilizing imaginaries in tourism and beyond*. Berghahn.

Salazar, N. B. (2011a). Grounding mobilities: Rethinking border-crossing tourism and migration. In E. Judd & J. Zhang (Eds.), *Labor migration and social mobility in Asia and Pacific region* (pp. 8–25). Intellectual Property Publishing House.

Salazar, N. B. (2011b). The power of imagination in transnational mobilities. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, *18*(6), 576–598. https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2011.672859

Salazar, N. B. (2012). The (im)mobility of tourism imaginaries. In M. Smith & G. Richards (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of cultural tourism* (pp. 34–39). Routledge.

Salazar, N. B. (2013a). Anthropology. In P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, & M. Sheller (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of mobilities* (pp. 55–63). Routledge.

Salazar, N. B. (2013b). Mobility. In R. J. McGee & R. L. Warms (Eds.), *Theory in social and cultural anthropology* (Vol. 1, pp. 552–553). Sage.

Salazar, N. B. (2016). Conceptual notes on the freedom of movement and bounded mobilities. In M. Gutekunst, A. Hackl, S. Leoncini, J. S. Schwarz, & I. Götz (Eds.), *Bounded mobilities: Ethnographic perspectives on social hierarchies and global inequalities* (pp. 283–289). Transcript.

Salazar, N. B. (2017). The cosmopolitanization of tourism: An afterthought. In R. Shepherd (Ed.), *Cosmopolitanism and tourism: Rethinking theory and practice* (pp. 187–194). Lexington.

Salazar, N. B. (2018). *Momentous mobilities: Anthropological musings on the meanings of travel*. Berghahn.

Salazar, N. B., & Glick Schiller, N. (Eds.). (2014). *Regimes of mobility: Imaginaries and relationalities of power*. Routledge.

Schellhorn, M. (2010). Development for whom? Social justice and the business of ecotourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *18*(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580903367229

Teampău, P., & Van Assche, K. (2009). Migratory marginalities: Making sense of home, self and mobility. *Ethnologia Balkanica*, *13*, 147–162.

Tuulentie, S., & Heimtun, B. (2014). New rural residents or working tourists? Place attachment of mobile tourism workers in Finnish Lapland and Northern Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *14*(4), 367–384. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2014.967998

UNEP/UNWTO. (2005). *Making tourism more sustainable: A guide for policy makers*. UNEP/UNWTO.

Vallance, S., Perkins, H. C., & Dixon, J. E. (2011). What is social sustainability? A clarification of concepts. *Geoforum*, *42*(3), 342–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.01.002

WCED. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.

Williams, D. R., & Van Patten, S. R. (2006). Home *and* away? Creating identities and sustaining places in a multi-centred world. In N. McIntyre, D. R. Williams, & K. McHugh (Eds.), *Multiple dwelling and tourism: Negotiating place, home, and identity* (pp. 32–50). CABI.